# A GENERAL HISTORY OF THE WORLD

*By*

*VICTOR DURUY*

MINISTER OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION AND MEMBER OF THE ACADÉMIE FRANÇAISE

WITH A SUMMARY OF CONTEMPORANEOUS HISTORY

BY

EDWIN A. GROSVENOR

PROFESSOR OF MODERN GOVERNMENTS AND INTERNATIONAL LAW IN AMHERST COLLEGE

*AND*

LOUIS E. VAN NORMAN

ASSOCIATE EDITOR "AMERICAN REVIEW OF REVIEWS"
AUTHOR OF "POLAND, THE KNIGHT AMONG NATIONS"

VOL. III

*1912*

*THE REVIEW OF REVIEWS CO.*

*NEW YORK*

COPYRIGHT 1898, 1899, 1901,
BY THOMAS Y. CROWELL & CO.

COPYRIGHT 1912,
BY THOMAS Y. CROWELL COMPANY

THE FERRIS PRINTING COMPANY
NEW YORK CITY, N. Y., U. S. A.

# HISTORY OF MODERN TIMES

## VICTORIOUS COALITION OF PEOPLES AND KINGS AGAINST NAPOLEON

### (1811-1815)

**Popular Reaction against the Spirit of Conquest represented by Napoleon.**—The revolution of 1688 in England remained wholly English, so it did not leave its own island. The French Revolution was cosmopolitan. The members of the French National Assembly, not merely solicitous of the ancient liberties of the country, had the larger idea of rights common to all men united in society. Thus they placed the Declaration of Rights as a preamble to the Constitution of 1791. They thought of humanity no less than of France. This largeness of view constituted the grandeur and also the misery of the French Revolution. As a result the new order of things emerged from the past only with frightful throes.

But the general character of the first French Constitution and of the principles of 1789 applied as fully to the banks of the Meuse, the Rhine, and the Po, as to the banks of the Seine. Hence this sentiment aided in French success. One day the Revolution abdicated its principles into the hands of a soldier of genius. He separated the legacy of 1789 into two parts. The one, liberty, he postponed; the other part, civil equality, he undertook to establish everywhere. In this task he sought the greatness of France, but above all his own. Condemned by the hatred of the English aristocracy to an endless war, he forgot in the intoxication of victory and power his true rôle and assumed that of a conqueror whose hand brushes aside or reduces to powder every obstacle. Thus at Presburg and Tilsit, Napoleon

rearranged the map of Central Europe according to his will and indulged in dreams even greater than the realities of which he furnished a spectacle to the world. The nations, formerly allies of France, became for him the pieces on a chess board wherewith he played the game solely according to the combinations of his own mind. He seized some, he delivered others, without the slightest heed to those old traditions, affections, or interests which would not change. And he never dreamed that from the midst of those masses, for a time inert, a force was soon to spring greater than that of the best drilled armies, more formidable than those coalitions of kings which he had already for four times destroyed. This force was found in the will of men resolved that they would no longer be treated like cattle which are bought and sold, yoked or separated. Indifferent at first to the fall of their royal houses, the peoples at length understood that they were the cruelly tried victims of those political convulsions. They learned that independence is not only national dignity as liberty is individual dignity, but that it is also the safeguard of personal interests. They learned that habits, ideas, and one's most private feelings are sadly wounded by a foreign master, even though he presents himself with his hands full of benefits. Then, to defend their political conscience, men regained the enthusiasm which they had possessed three centuries earlier to defend their religious conscience. It is a painful confession for France, though none the less true, that the force which shattered Napoleon and the French state was of the same nature, though of another order, as that which had shattered Philip II and the Inquisition.

**Preparation for Insurrection in Germany.**—After having broken up a fifth coalition at Wagram, Napoleon thought that he was more secure than ever. But his arms were no longer invincible. Junot and even Masséna were unable to conquer Portugal and General Dupont signed in 1808 the shameful capitulation of Baylen. The hopes of the enemy increased and England was confirmed in her resolution to fight to the death, when she beheld hostility against Napoleon on the part of the

government gradually descending into the hearts of the people.

After Jena Prussia had given up the struggle. Army corps capitulated without a combat. Powerful fortresses surrendered without firing a shot. Nevertheless she was the principal instrument of German vengeance against France, although her own virtues did not prepare her for that great rôle. None of the persons around her king, Frederick William, and not even he himself had the conception of anything different from the ancient Prussian monarchical system. The number of those who resigned themselves to the existing condition of affairs was very large. Germans like Stein of Nassau and Scharnhorst and Hardenberg of Hanover, who were strangers to Prussia, brought about the regeneration of that country. Baron Stein set to work immediately after Tilsit. "The sentiment of a common existence must be aroused," said he. "The forces which lie quiescent must be utilized. An alliance must be concluded between the spirit of the nation and the spirit of authority." He abolished serfdom of the soil. He granted to the peasants the right of holding property and to the cities the right of appointing their own magistrates and of administering their own affairs by elective councils. He reformed the higher administration in a liberal sense and caused it to be decided that rank and office, hitherto reserved to the nobles, should form the reward of courage and merit. Scharnhorst, on being appointed Minister of War, undertook to evade the article of the treaty of Tilsit which reduced the standing army of Prussia to 42,000 men. He insisted upon obligatory service under the flag for all men of an age to bear arms, sending them home as soon as they were sufficiently trained. In a short time in this way he prepared an army of 150,000 men who only awaited the signal of a grand uprising to make their appearance on the field of battle. These reforms, inspired by the ideas of 1789, renewed patriotism and created a public spirit in Prussia by interesting all classes of the population in the public safety. An association, founded by several professors under the title of the Association of Virtue, or Tugendbund, had at first

only twenty members, but rapidly spread throughout all Germany, where the affiliated were soon numbered by thousands. Its self-appointed mission was to restore "German strength and character." In 1809 one of its members, the student Staaps, tried to assassinate Napoleon at Schönbrunn. Though proscribed, the Association continued to exist in secret. It penetrated the deepest strata of the population and prepared the way for the awakening of 1813.

**Progress of Liberal Ideas in Europe.**—The resistance of Spain produced a great sensation in Germany. Stein turned to profit every piece of news which reached him concerning that heroic struggle. Napoleon, a genius of the military order, took little heed of moral forces. He believed in himself and in his strategic or administrative combinations, and never dreamed that an idea could stand firm against the shot of cannon. Thus the signifiance of Stein's reforms escaped him. He laughed at the minister who "in default of troops of the line meditated the sublime project of raising the masses." But later on he demanded his dismissal and finally in an insulting decree dated from Madrid he proscribed "the said Stein" (1809). The insult was deeply resented throughout the whole of Prussia and Germany. Nevertheless Hardenberg continued his reforms in the emancipation of the peasants, in securing freedom of industry for the purpose of stimulating labor, and in abolishing some exceptional laws leveled against the Jews. Not to leave any force unemployed, he created the University of Berlin (1810), whence Fichte was to address his discourses to the German people, and which sent as many recruits to the insurrection as did the burning poems of Arndt and Schenkendorff, the *Death Song* of Körner, and the *Sonnets* of Rückert. "Then was born in tears, in blood and despair, but also in prayer and faith, the idea of liberty, the consciousness of the fatherland."

Thus liberal ideas were likewise turning against France in Spain and Italy. The Cortes of Cadiz drew up a constitution derived from the principles of 1789. It declared the sovereignty of the nation, the delegation of

the executive power to the king and of the legislative power to the representatives of the country, the responsibility of the ministers, and the suppression of privileges in adjusting taxation. The former king of Naples, who fled to Sicily, gave that province a constitution modeled upon that of England. Thus kings and peoples were preparing to fight France with the very weapons which at the beginning of the Revolutionary wars had ensured her conquest of the Netherlands, Holland, the right bank of the Rhine, Switzerland, and Italy. Privileges were abolished. What still survived of feudalism was replaced by free institutions. As France now represented military dictatorship, an ancient and worn-out form of government, she was bound, despite the extraordinary man placed at her head, to succumb in the struggle.

**Formation or Awakening of the Nations.**—France was now opposed by two irresistible forces. One force she had herself created. It was that of liberal ideas and of the sovereign rights of the nation with all the consequences which flow therefrom. The foundation of the other force she had provoked by doing violence to the peoples. This force was the new principle of nationality. Under the pressure of French weapons the Spanish insurgents and the members of the Tugendbund had recovered the fatherland, to which their ancestors in the eighteenth century had paid so little heed. While they demanded the abolition of unjust privileges, they wished to preserve their autonomy. Thus in the mountains of Castile, of the Tyrol, and of Bohemia, on the banks of the Elbe and the Oder, as in the plains of Brandenburg, this idea of nationality had its birth or its revelation. It renewed history by introducing the question of race; literature, by investigation of folk songs; philology, by comparison of languages; politics, by the study of the interests which result from a common origin, a common language, and common traditions. It is this idea which in our own day has made Italy and Germany into nations.

As early as 1809, when Austria had completed her armaments against France, public opinion in Germany with energy demanded that Prussia should take part in

the war. Scharnhorst urged the king to this step, but Frederick William dared not undertake anything so bold. After Wagram he humbly made reparation to the victor for the premature patriotism of Prussian subjects. Nevertheless the secret movement, undermining the earth beneath the feet of the mighty autocrat of the West, was making progress. Many persons even in France discerned the signs of impending ruin. It was at this crisis that Napoleon undertook the rashest of all his expeditions.

**Moscow** (1812). **Leipzig** (1813). **Campaign in France** (1814).—To compel Russia not to abandon the scheme of continental blockade he led his armies 600 leagues distant from France, while 270,000 of his best troops and his most skillful captains were occupied at the other extremity of the continent in front of Cadiz and of the English army under Wellington. On June 24, 1812, he crossed the Niemen at the head of 450,000 men. Six days before the Congress at Washington had declared war against the cabinet of St. James, because English cruisers insisted obstinately on the right to search vessels engaged in American commerce. Had the emperor renounced his mad expedition to Russia, had he, as in 1804, centered his forces and his genius upon the war with England and aided the new ally who was arising on the other side of the Atlantic, unlooked-for results might have been brought about. Unfortunately he trusted in himself alone. At first the expedition appeared to be successful. The Russians were everywhere routed as at Vitebk, Smolensk, and Beresina. The bloody battle of the Moskva delivered into his power Moscow, the second capital of the empire, to which the Russians set fire as they retreated.

To his misfortune he thought he had secured a peace by his victories. He waited for it and wasted precious time. When he realized that to extort it a second expedition against St. Petersburg was necessary, it was too late. It was impossible to winter in the heart of a ravaged country and he was compelled to retreat. The retreat might have escaped disaster, had not the winter been unusually early and severe, and had not provisions

failed. The greater part of the army, all the horses, all the baggage, perished or were abandoned, either in the snows or at the fatal passage of the Beresina.

While the Grand Army was melting away, infidelity and treason against which Napoleon should have provided were breaking out behind him. He had forced Prussia, Austria, and the Confederates of the Rhine to furnish him numerous contingents. But Arndt, who had taken refuge in Sweden, and Stein, who had fled to Russia, were inundating Germany with patriotic pamphlets, wherein they called upon the Germans in the French army to desert, and represented the Tsar Alexander as the liberator of the nations. Their counsels were heeded. York, who commanded a part of the Prussian contingent, passed over to the Russians. Frederick William III at once engaged in a two-faced policy. He assured Napoleon "that he was the natural ally of France." He informed Alexander that he was only waiting for the right moment to join him with all his people. He even suggested to Napoleon that everything might be arranged by giving the kingdom of Poland to the king of Prussia and trusting him to arrest "the aggressions of the Russian power." This proposition was a treason even to the "German fatherland."

Frederick William believed that such duplicity was required by the circumstances. Therein he continued the policy of Frederick II, which justified whatever furthered the success of the Hohenzollerns. But Bülow, who commanded another Prussian corps, followed York's example. Then Stein hastened to Königsberg, the capital of the province of Prussia, which was in full revolt against the king because the latter appeared to disavow his generals and still to side with Napoleon. The states of the province organized war to the death. On February 7 was issued the order concerning the whole military force of the country, the landwehr and the landsturm. A population of a million inhabitants furnished 60,000 soldiers. Then, while still negotiating, the king of Prussia decided to take up arms. Not, however, till February 28, 1813, did he sign the Treaty of Kalisch

with Russia. But here again he did not forget the interests of his house, for he made Alexander guarantee him aggrandizement in Germany in exchange for Polish territories. He desired the acquisition of Saxony, which would strengthen Prussia toward the mountains of Bohemia and fortify his position in Silesia.

The long hesitation of Frederick William was due to his uneasiness at the popular movement incited by his ministers. He regarded the people as valuable for saving his crown, but had no idea of rewarding their service by the grant of public liberty. But he could no longer hold back. He launched the "appeal to my people," together with an edict full of warlike fury concerning the landwehr and the landsturm. At the same time the lecture-rooms of the universities and the churches rang with calls to arms. The generals and the ministers in their proclamations were lavish of promises of liberty. The war of the nations had begun.

After the passage of the Beresina, Napoleon, who had hastened to Paris, raised another army. But his allies with the exception of Denmark had turned against him. Sweden, led by a former French general, Bernadotte, had set the example of defection. Austria was waiting for a favorable opportunity to unite her arms with those of the Russians, victors without a battle. The whole of Germany, undermined by secret societies, held itself ready to pass over even on the battlefield itself to the ranks of the enemy. The brilliant victories of Lützen, Bautzen, and Wurschen, won by Napoleon with conscripts in the campaign of 1813, arrested for a time the action of Austria. But that power at last forgot the ties which she had formed and the emperor Francis soon marched to aid in dethroning his daughter and grandson.

Three hundred thousand men assembled at Leipzig against Napoleon's 170,000 soldiers. After a gigantic struggle of three days' duration, aided by the treachery of the Saxons, who in the middle of the action deserted to their side, they forced Napoleon to abandon the field of battle, for the first time vanquished. He was obliged to retreat as far as the Rhine.

In the following year began that memorable campaign

in France where the military genius of the emperor worked miracles. But while he was heroically struggling with a few thousand brave men against combined Europe the royalists raised their heads and the liberals made untimely opposition to his measures. At that critical moment a dictatorship was needed to spare France foreign invasion, that greatest shame which a nation can undergo, but men talked only of political rights and of liberty! To many the enemy seemed a liberator. In vain did Napoleon conquer at Campaubert, at Montmirail, and at Montereau. The allies continued to advance, favored by the desertions which broke out in all directions, especially in the south, by which road came Wellington and the English, whom Marshal Soult brought to a temporary halt at the battle of Toulouse.

A bold attack on the hostile rear guard might perhaps have saved France. If Paris could but stand firm for a few days, the allies, cut off from their communications, would have been ruined. But Paris, defended only for twelve hours, capitulated (March 30), and the Senate proclaimed the deposition of the emperor. He himself signed his abdication at Fontainebleau (April 11).

**The First Restoration. The Hundred Days. Waterloo** (1814-1815).—The French princes of the house of Bourbon had fought in the enemy's ranks. The Tsar, the king of Prussia, and the emperor of Austria, finding themselves embarrassed as to the choice of government, were persuaded by Talleyrand and the royalists to recognize Louis XVIII, who dated his reign from the death of his nephew, the son of Louis XVI. The white flag replaced the flag of Austerlitz and France reëntered the boundaries of the days before the Revolution. She surrendered fifty-eight strongholds which her troops still held, 12,000 cannon, thirty vessels, and twelve frigates by the first Treaty of Paris, May 30, 1814. In compensation for so many sacrifices Louis XVIII granted a constitutional charter which created two Chambers wherein national interests were to be discussed. The emigrants, who had returned with the princes, were irritated by these concessions made to new ideas. The greed of some, the superannuated pretensions of others, the excesses of

all, excited a discontent whose echo reached the island of Elba, whither Napoleon had been banished. He thought that in consequence of the general dissatisfaction he could retrieve his disasters. On March 1, 1815, he landed with 800 men on the coast of Provence. All the troops sent against him passed over to his side. Without firing a shot he reëntered Paris, whence the Bourbons fled for the second time. But the allied princes had not yet dismissed their troops. They were then assembled at the Congress of Vienna, occupied in settling after their own pleasure the affairs of Europe. They again launched 800,000 men against France and placed Napoleon under the ban of the nations.

In the meantime the emperor had tried to rally the Liberals to his side by proclaiming the Act, additional to the Constitution of the Empire, which confirmed most of the principles contained in the charter. As soon as he had reëstablished order at home, he hastened to march against Wellington and Blücher. He defeated the Prussians at Ligny (June 16, 1815) and for half a day fought victoriously with 71,000 men against 80,000 English, Belgians, and Hanoverians. Wellington was near retreat, when the Prussians, who had escaped through a fatal combination of circumstances from Marshal Grouchy, fell upon the exhausted French (June 18). The catastrophe of Waterloo was a death-blow to the empire. Napoleon again abdicated in favor of his son, Napoleon II (June 22). Paris for the second time beheld foreigners enter her walls, pillage her museums, and strip her libraries. Napoleon was exiled to Saint Helena in the middle of the Atlantic Ocean. There he died on May 5, 1821, after six years of painful captivity.

## REORGANIZATION OF EUROPE AT THE CONGRESS OF VIENNA. THE HOLY ALLIANCE

**Reorganization of Europe at the Congress of Vienna. The Holy Alliance. Congress of Vienna** (1815).—The second Treaty of Paris (November 20, 1815) was more disastrous than the first. A war indemnity was imposed of 700,000,000 francs, not reckoning special claims which amounted to 370,000,000. The foreign occupation was to last five years. Rectifications of the frontier deprived France of Chambéry, Annecy, Philippeville, Marienburg, Sarrelouis, Landau, and the duchy of Bouillon, and created in the line of defense the gaps of the Ardennes, the Moselle, and Savoy. In Alsace Strasburg was uncovered by the loss of Landau, and the dismantling of Huningue opened a new road for invasion. On the sea Tobago, Santa Lucia, the Île de France, and the Seychelles were lost. England, while leaving France her trading posts in India, denied her the right to fortify them. But some still greater disasters were escaped. England, through a wise policy unwilling to shake the throne of the Bourbons, and the Emperor Alexander, on account of his personal sympathy for France, vetoed the plans of Prussia, who was already ambitious of securing Alsace and Lorraine.

The Congress of Vienna to regulate European affairs opened in September, 1814. All the excesses with which Napoleon had been reproached were repeated there. The four sovereigns of Russia, England, Prussia, and Austria, who had declared themselves the instruments of Providence against revolutionary France, remodeled the map of Europe as best profited their own ambition. It resembled a market of mankind. The commission, charged with dividing up the human herd among the kings, was greatly troubled by the exigencies of Prussia, who demanded 3,300,000 additional subjects as an indemnity. The Congress even discussed the quality of the human merchandise and gravely recognized the fact that a former Frenchman of Aix-la-Chapelle or Cologne was

worth more than a Pole. In order to equalize the lots they reckoned a number of men from the left bank of the Rhine equivalent to a larger number from the right bank of the Oder.

The agreement of the four Powers removed all difficulties at the expense of the weak. In Germany the petty princes, secular or ecclesiastical, and the free cities were shared without scruple as almost worthless booty. But this trade in white men came near rupturing the coalition. Russia and Prussia had come to an understanding that the former should annex the whole of Poland, and the latter in exchange for her Polish provinces the whole of Saxony. "Each must find what suits him," said the Tsar. England, Austria, and France united in frustrating this plan by the secret treaty of January 3, 1815. The French ambassador, M. de Talleyrand, succeeded in saving the king of Saxony. At the same time he ruined France by proposing to annex to Prussia in exchange for the Saxon provinces which she specially desired the Rhenish provinces for which she cared less. Later French misfortunes sprang from this substitution.

Russia received the greater part of the grand duchy of Warsaw, together with western Galicia and the circle of Zamosk. Austria gained the Venetian states, Ragusa, the valleys of the Valteline, Bormio, and Chiavenna. Also Saltzburg and the Tyrol were restored to her. Prussia acquired the duchy of Posen, Swedish Pomerania, Westphalia, and 700,000 inhabitants in Saxony. England asked nothing on the continent. The electorate of Hanover with increased territory was restored to her royal family. Moreover she might well be content with retaining the acquisitions made in every sea in the struggle against the Revolution and the Empire. She retained Heligoland, opposite the mouth of the Elbe and the Weser; the protectorate of the Ionian Isles at the entrance to the Adriatic; Malta, between Sicily and Africa; Santa Lucia and Tobago in the Antilles; the Seychelles and the Ile de France in the Indian Ocean, and finally Ceylon and the Dutch colonies of the Cape of Good Hope.

France, relatively weaker as the power of the four great states increased, still seemed formidable enough to render precautions necessary against her even along her exposed frontiers. The coalition shrewdly established its advance posts. On the north it united Belgium and Holland into one kingdom under the Prince of Orange. On the northeast was the Rhenish country, the larger part of which was assigned to Prussia, while the remainder was divided between Holland, Hesse-Darmstadt, and Bavaria. The latter was formerly the ally but now about to become the enemy of France. Finally on the south the restoration of Savoy to the king of Piedmont placed Lyons, the second capital of France, within two days of the armies of the coalition.

The most difficult problem had been to reconstitute the Confederation of the Rhine, which was directed against France as the Germanic Confederation. Long and violent debates arose on this subject in the Congress, where the petty states made energetic efforts to preserve their independence. The advocates of German union, including Prussia, wished to reëstablish the ancient German Empire. Austria dared not resume the ancient crown of the Hapsburgs. The kings of Bavaria and Würtemberg were resolved that the crowns which Napoleon had placed on their heads should not fall. Already, when the extinction of Saxony was discussed, Bavaria had promised M. de Talleyrand 30,000 men if France, joining Austria and England, would drive Prussia into Brandenburg and Russia beyond the Vistula. Würtemberg, Hanover, Baden, and Hesse advocated the same project. It was agreed that the empire, destroyed in 1806, should not be set up again.

When the news of Napoleon's return from Elba arrived, "a hut was constructed in all haste to shelter Germany during the storm, a miserable refuge, which the princes themselves destroyed later on." This Confederation, of which a German diplomat spoke with such contempt, was to consist of thirty-nine states, which were to send deputies to Frankfort to a Diet, over which Austria was always to preside.

This Diet was to be composed of two assemblies. The

first or ordinary assembly numbered seventeen votes, that is to say, one vote for each of the great Confederates and one also for each group into which the petty states had been collected. In the general assembly each Confederate had a number of votes proportioned to its importance. The former assembly was to settle current affairs; the latter was to be convoked whenever a question arose concerning fundamental laws or important interests of the federal act. The Confederates were to retain their sovereign independence, their armies, and their diplomatic representation. But the Confederation was also to have its own army and to hold the fortresses which were built with the indemnity paid by France. Thus Luxemburg, Mayence, and Landau were to cut off from France the approach to the Rhine, just as Rastadt and Ulm could prevent a French advance to the Black Forest or the valleys of the Danube.

In Switzerland, Geneva and Vaud were enlarged at French expense by a part of the country of Gex and some communes in Savoy. Valais, Geneva, and Neuchâtel were added to the nineteen original cantons and formed the Helvetian Confederation, which the Congress declared neutral territory. In Italy the king of the Two Sicilies and the Pope recovered what they had lost, but Austria again became all-powerful in the peninsula. Mistress of Milan and Venetia, she made sure of the right bank of the Po through the right of placing a garrison in Placentia, Ferrara, and Comacchio. She had enthroned an archduke in Tuscany, and had stipulated that the duchies of Parma, Placentia, and Guastalla, ceded for life to the ex-Empress Marie Louise, and the duchy of Modena, given to an Austrian prince, should revert to the Austrian crown. Moreover the king of Piedmont, although he had received Genoa and Savoy, was exposed on the Tessin border and seemed at the mercy of his formidable neighbor.

In the north of Europe Sweden, in compensation for Finland, which had been taken by Russia, received Norway, which was taken from Denmark. Denmark in turn was to have in compensation Swedish Pomerania and Rügen. But Prussia, implacable against the little Dan-

ish state which alone had been always faithful to France, forced her to exchange these countries for Lauenburg. This duchy like that of Holstein was only the personal domain of the king, who through his possession of these two German provinces became a member of the Germanic Confederation, that is, of a state organized against France. Denmark experienced later the effect of these artificial combinations.

**The Holy Alliance** (1815).—The stipulations of the Congress of Vienna (June 9, 1815) constituted the most important act which diplomacy had effected in Europe since the conclusion of the peace of Westphalia. The sovereigns of Russia, Austria, and Prussia undertook to give it religious consecration. On September 14, 1816, under the inspiration of the Tsar Alexander, they signed at Paris the Treaty of the Holy Alliance, wherein they asserted " in the face of the universe, their unalterable determination to take as their rule of conduct, both in the administration of their respective states and in their political relations with every other government, only the precepts of the Christian religion, precepts of justice, charity, and peace." In consequence they bound themselves, in the first article, to regard each other as " brethren," in the second, " to display to one another an unalterable good-will," considering themselves " delegated by Providence to govern three branches of one and the same family, to wit, Austria, Prussia, and Russia," to form but one Christian nation, which should have for its sovereign " Him to Whom alone power belongs as His possession, because in Him are found all the treasures of love, of knowledge, and of infinite wisdom." The kings of constitutional countries could not sign the Treaty of the Holy Alliance, but in all lands a party upheld its principles.

Thus was crowned by a mystical and sentimental act the most self-seeking work of politics. These words, " justice and love," present a singular contrast to the real state of things. " Public right," said Hardenberg, " is useless; " to which Alexander added, " You are always talking to me of principles. I do not know what you mean. What, think you, do I care for your parch-

ments and your treaties?" However, it was at the Congress of Vienna that Talleyrand invented the word "legitimacy." That city, where so many jealousies were in conflict and where so little consideration was paid the wishes and the true interests of kings and nations, was a strange cradle for any idea of rights.

In order to satisfy political requirements Belgium had been yoked with Holland much against her will, and Italy had been handed over to Austria. Thus the way was paved for insurrection in the Netherlands and the peninsula. Poland, dismembered, remained a perpetual cause of conflict between the three "brother monarchs." And lastly, by forgetting the liberal promises made to the peoples in order to stir them up against Napoleon, the spirit of revolt was destined soon to shake that edifice so laboriously erected and of which at the present time nothing remains.

The Germanic Confederation seemed fitted, it is true, to assure continental peace by separating the three great military states of Prussia, Austria, and France. The temporizing German character seemed interposed between three countries accustomed to rapid action: between Russia, which utilizes to the utmost ideas of race and religion; England, which obeys the commercial spirit; and France, which is prone to move with sudden and hasty impulse. As the Germany of 1815 was built on perpetual compromises, it represented in European affairs the genius of compromise, which is that of diplomacy. To fully render this service to the peace of the world, of necessity the Confederation should have been organized for defense and not for attack, and should have been independent both of Berlin and Vienna. But the rivalries and antagonisms of the two were to keep the Confederation in constant anxiety and turmoil and to cease only when one should be able to expel the other.

In 1815 the preponderance in Europe seemed for a long time assured to Russia and England, the two powers which had been invulnerable even to the sword of Napoleon.

## THE HOLY ALLIANCE. SECRET SOCIETIES AND REVOLUTIONS
### (1815-1824)

**Character of the Period between 1815 and 1830.**—As the National Assembly of 1789 paid more heed to ideas than to facts,—a course which philosophy always pursues but which politics never does,—it had revived and applied to vast multitudes such principles of political liberty and civil equality as had seldom been realized except in small cities and tribes. Unfortunately society, like an individual, can never carry two ideas to victory at the same time. Equality, inscribed in the Code Napoléon, very quickly passed into the national character, and the French soldiers carried its fruitful germ throughout all Europe. The Terror, civil discords, and the ambition of a great man postponed the triumph of civil liberty. None the less the spirit of liberty among many European peoples united with the sentiment of nationality and added strength to the forces which threatened Napoleon. But the victors of Leipzig and Waterloo had no idea of giving it a place in the national law. They combined on the contrary to fetter what they called revolutionary passion, but what was only, if we eliminate its excesses and crimes, a new and legitimate evolution of humanity. The struggle in which they engaged against the new spirit forms the principal interest of the drama unrolling between 1815 and 1830.

In this drama, on which side was justice and consequently the right to life and success? This is the question which must be put in front of every great social conflict. Setting aside commonplace accusations of hypocrisy and obstinacy, of fondness for disorder and search for utopias, there always remains the inevitable battle between an old society, which is unwilling to die, and a new society, which persists in making a place for itself in the world and which deserves to have one.

Unfortunately this struggle was envenomed by passions which impelled one party to cruel acts of violence

and the other to criminal conspiracies. The golden mean would have been attained by following the example of England in 1689. Thus the spirit of conservatism would have been retained from the past but vivified for the satisfaction of new needs by the spirit of progress, which absolute royalty had formerly favored but which in the nineteenth century could be favored only by liberty. Its triumph was rendered impossible by the Holy Alliance through a system of stern repression which excited revolutionary activity throughout all Europe.

**Efforts to preserve or reëstablish the Old Régime.**—The Revolution of 1789, undertaken to secure for the individual the greatest sum of liberty, had on the contrary increased the strength of the government in the countries where it temporarily triumphed, as well as in those which felt only its counter-shock. Twenty-three years of war trained the people to furnish more liberally their tribute of blood and their tribute of money. They paid more and conscription or voluntary service took the place of voluntary enlistment. Moreover administrative authority, formerly dispersed among many intermediate bodies, had reverted to the prince, and an energetic centralization had restored to his hands all the national forces.

Thus the "paternal" governments were stronger in 1815 than in 1789. They had larger resources to enforce obedience. They found in their path fewer of those traditional obstacles which seem so fragile and which are sometimes so unyielding. Leipzig and Waterloo made them the masters of the world. They insisted upon so organizing their conquest as to restore order. It soon seemed to them that this order could be assured only on condition of arresting all movement, that is to say, of stifling the new life which was for them, according to the expression of Frederick William IV, only the "contagion of impiety." Victorious over the Revolution by virtue of arms, they wished to be victorious also by virtue of institutions and by inflexible severity.

At Palermo and Madrid the Constitutions of 1812 were abolished and absolute power was restored. At Milan the Austrian Code replaced the French Code and cannon, trained with lighted fuses on the public square, indi-

cated what system of government was being reëstablished. The States of the Church and Piedmont returned to the same situation as in 1790. The institutions of Joseph II in Austria, of Leopold I in Tuscany, and of Tanucci at Naples were condemned as mischievous. In order to prevent the return of "those reforms, more abusive than the abuses themselves," a secret article of the treaty, signed at Vienna on June 12, 1815, by Frederick IV, stated, "It is understood that the king of the Two Sicilies, in reëstablishing the government of the kingdom, will tolerate no changes which cannot be reconciled with the principles adopted by his Imperial and Royal Apostolic Majesty for the internal management of his Italian possessions." Then too, south of the Alps and of the Pyrenees, the privileges of the clergy and nobility were revived and the Inquisition flourished once more, while the friends of public liberty set out on the road to exile, to prison, and even the scaffold.

In Germany the princes forgot their promises of 1813, except in Bavaria and a few petty states belonging to the ancient Confederation of the Rhine. As for Austria and Prussia, it seemed as if nothing had taken place in the world during a quarter of a century. In both the patriarchal system was maintained, defended by 300,000 soldiers on the Danube and 200,000 on the Spree, and also by the immense army of functionaries. Even a Prussian league of nobles was formed to maintain the distinction of classes and feudal immunities. The Tories continued to govern England in the interest of the aristocracy. The royalists of France would have gladly reorganized everything in the same way for the advantage of the great proprietors and of the clergy. In the Chamber of Deputies under the leadership of La Bourdonnaye, Marcellus, and Villèle, men talked openly of returning to the old régime even by a bloody path. The emigrants of Coblentz and the fugitives of Ghent were determined to have their revenge for their two exiles. In the official world they obtained it by means of laws and decisions which were often dictated by passion, and among the masses, by means of murders which the authorities dared not or could not prevent or punish.. A

royal ordinance proscribed fifty-seven persons. Marshal Ney and several generals were condemned to death and shot. Marshal Brune and Generals Ramel and Lagarde were assassinated. The provosts' courts, from which there was no appeal and the sentences of which were executed within twenty-four hours, deserved their sinister reputation. The restored monarchy had its prison massacres, its terror, which was called the White Terror, its executioners, and its purveyors of victims who rivaled those of the Convention.

In Spain and in Italy there were the same excesses. Ferdinand VII at Madrid imprisoned, exiled, and condemned to death jealous partisans of the Constitution of 1812. At Naples the Calderari, or coppersmiths, who had been pitted against the Carbonari, pillaged and assassinated on behalf of the Minister of Police, the Prince di Canosa, whose deeds of violence went so far that the allied kings, fearing serious troubles, demanded his removal.

Louis XVIII was also disturbed by the excessive zeal of his dangerous friends, more royalist than the king himself. By the ordinance of September 6, 1816, which the extremists called a coup d'état, he dismissed the ultra-royalist Chamber. This measure was in accordance with public sentiment, for France was by no means exclusively composed of reactionaries. In spite of her misfortunes she showed remarkable vitality. Furthermore the ideas of 1789, grafted in part on the civil code, had maintained a liberal spirit in the country in advance of the rest of Europe. In the charter granted by Louis XVIII the idea of national sovereignty was greatly obscured by vestiges of the theory of divine rights. But offices were no longer sold, or lettres de cachet issued, or secret procedure indulged in. Justice did not depend upon the ruling power. The treasury belonged to the nation. The laws were discussed by representatives of the country instead of being made by the sovereign. The publicity of debate furnished a powerful guarantee for the impartiality of the judge and the wisdom of the legislator, over whose actions and votes public opinion kept watch. Thanks to the wisdom of the sovereign,

the era of representative government really began for France at the time when it was disappearing in Spain and Italy and when the German princes were evading the execution of that article of the Federal Compact which promised it to their peoples. Thus, although 150,000 foreigners still occupied the French provinces, all eyes remained fixed upon France, where the new era had first dawned and where it seemed on the point of reviving.

**Alliance of the Altar and the Throne. The Congregation.**—But this return to the wise ideas of the first National Assembly did not suit the calculations of the clergy, the nobility, the adherents of right divine, and the privileged classes of all sorts, who, for the sake of combating a social order contrary to their habits of mind and existence, employed every weapon. Religion was the special weapon which seemed bound to be most efficacious.

The considerations of the princes were mainly temporal. Although they had concluded a holy alliance, religion was in their eyes only the tool of politics. But the papacy, which had also just recovered its territorial power, took alarm at the state of men's minds. Philosophy, the sciences, and liberty of thought seemed to it far more to be dreaded than Luther and Calvin. It wished on behalf of the Church to take part in the campaign upon which the kings had entered for the sake of maintaining royal power. The Roman curia became the resolute, implacable adversary of that modern spirit which is destined to triumph, since it is only the necessary and divine development of human reason and conscience. With each generation Rome enlarged her claims, the final word of which has been uttered in our own day in the Syllabus and in papal infallibility.

Those who in the sixteenth century had been her ablest auxiliaries against the Reformation offered her their constant aid. The Jesuits, whose order, half a century before Pope Clement XIV had declared abolished, had just been reëstablished by Pius VII (1814). From Rome they rapidly spread over the Catholic world, especially through France, where, although not yet legally

recognized, they were always more numerous than elsewhere. They displayed against the new enemy the same skill which they had manifested after the Council of Trent. Their deservedly famous missions brought about many conversions. But the Jesuits then inspired zealous Roman Catholics and most of the clergy with such distrust as prevented their being intrusted with the education of the young. The superintendence of the higher schools in France was committed to the bishops. This they had already secured in the other Catholic countries. After the fall of the Directory a reaction had sprung up in France against the irreligious spirit of the eighteenth century. This reaction spread through all European countries, Chateaubriand with his *Genius of Christianity* being its most brilliant exponent. At his side stood a logician, De Bonald, with his *Primitive Legislation,* and De Maistre, "a savage Bossuet," a man of passionate eloquence and of uncompromising disposition. These two, full of mediæval theories, dreamed of such a triumph for the ideas of Gregory VII as that tireless old man had never been able to secure himself. Because Chateaubriand, De Bonald, and De Maistre were not priests, but laymen, they drew the more attention. An audacious priest, Lamennais, wrote the *Essay on Indifference* and aimed at governing the world by papal infallibility. A society was formed to put in practice the ideas of Count de Maistre and to subject Italy at least to that theocratic government of which the Pope was to be the head.

In the sixteenth century in one-half of Europe the interests of the princes and of Rome were opposed. Religious parties were even at times revolutionary parties. Thus the League desired the commune, the Protestant gentlemen of France aimed at ridding themselves of royalty, and the Anabaptists declared war on society as a whole. After 1815 politics and religion were everywhere in accord even in Protestant monarchies, where the civil authorities sought alliance with the religious spirit. Poets, as in the early *Odes* of Victor Hugo and the *Méditations* of Lamartine, sang the majesty of worship and the sweetness of pious sentiments. Philosophers

erected theocracy into a system. Politicians wished to restore to the clergy its landed possessions, together with its civil power. Writers of all sorts furbished up a fantastic revival of the Middle Ages, peopled with brilliant cavaliers and fair and high-born ladies, with mighty kings and well-obeyed priests who together governed virtuous and disciplined populations. Society, which was profoundly moved by these various influences, especially in its upper classes, readily lent itself to the organization, "for the defense of the altar and the throne," of a secret body, the Congregation. This association numbered in France as many as 50,000 members, lay and ecclesiastical. Finally, in the last years of the Restoration, it controlled the government and the king and ended by overthrowing both.

The focus of this religious expansion was the very country where philosophy had reigned supreme. The phenomenon however was universal. In all churches fervor had redoubled. The Methodists in England and the United States, the Moravian Brethren, the Pietists in Germany and Switzerland, reawoke the iconoclastic zeal of the sixteenth century. Bible Societies found themselves possessed of sufficient funds to distribute gratuitously between 1803 and 1843, 12,000,000 Bibles. Madame Krüdener won over to her mystical ideas the Tsar Alexander, who expelled the Jesuits, but declared himself the protector of an association formed for the purpose of diffusing the New Testament among all the peoples of his empire. The Russian Princess Galitzin returned to the communion of Rome and her son became a missionary to the Indies. A Dane of almost royal blood, the Count von Stolberg, who had abjured Protestantism, wrote (1806-1818) a history of the Roman Church, so favorable to the Holy See, that the Roman propaganda made haste to translate and publish it in Italian. In Switzerland a grandson of the great Haller declared himself a Catholic and became the disciple of De Bonald. The most ancient university of England was agitated by the "Oxford Movement," and Newman, one of her great intellects, went over to the Roman fold.

One special attempt was made, not destitute of grandeur, if grandeur can attach in human affairs to undertakings condemned in advance to failure by their very nature. The protectorate over Protestant interests in Germany had belonged at first to the house of Saxony, the cradle of the Reformation, but that dynasty had lost this distinction on becoming Catholic for the sake of obtaining the Polish crown. This protectorate was claimed by the Electors of Brandenburg and was exercised by the sceptic Frederick II himself. After 1815, Frederick William II from religious zeal and dynastic self-interest tried to discipline the churches born of the Reformation, so as to oppose Protestant unity to Catholic unity, Berlin to Rome, the king of Prussia to the pontiff of the Vatican. He aimed at welding together the members of all the Protestant confessions, including those of England, into one evangelical church. He built them a temple and drew up a liturgy for the new cult. On October 18, 1817, the three hundredth anniversary of the foundation of Protestantism, he caused to be celebrated a Holy Communion, in which a Lutheran minister gave him the bread and a Calvinist minister the wine of the Sacrament. "They are uniting in a void!" exclaimed Gans; and he was right, for such union was a denial even of the Reformation, whose fundamental principle is liberty of individual examination. Therefore the scheme of Frederick William failed, but its political usefulness was too great to be abandoned.

So, in spite of the charters accorded and the constitutions granted or promised, and in spite also of the good intentions of certain princes to effect reforms, the ancient system, aided by the powerful organization of the Catholic Church and by the revival of religious sentiment, tried to hold its own or to renew itself in order to restore what the Revolution had destroyed. It wished to restore domination over human will and conscience with that preëminence of the powerful and that dependence of the lowly which seemed to some to have maintained tranquil and prosperous periods. But this reaction was often in contradiction with itself.

**Liberalism in the Press and Secret Societies.**—Confronting the powerful party which was dominated by the memory of past glories and recent misfortunes and which wished to protect society from storm by placing it under the double guardianship of monarchical faith and religious faith, there were enormous numbers who ardently cherished the memory of the ideas for which the Revolution and the national insurrections of the later days of the empire had been made. There were in Belgium, Italy, and Poland, patriots who would not accept the sway of the foreigner. There were everywhere the mixed multitudes, former freemasons or republicans, liberals or Bonapartists, who through self-interest, sentiment, or theory clung to the institutions of 1789 or 1804 and believed them necessary to good social order. In their ranks were men of heart and talent who openly advocated the new ideas in legislative chambers where such existed; in the courts, when a political case was on trial; in newspapers and books, and even in songs, wherever the censorship allowed them to appear. Such heroes in France were Benjamin Constant, Foy, Manuel, Étienne, Lafitte, the elder Dupin, Casimir-Périer, Paul Louis Courier, Béranger, Augustin Thierry, Cousin, and a thousand others. In Germany there were the great patriots of 1813, such as Arndt, Görres, Jahn, whom the Prussian police soon forbade to speak or to write. In Italy there were Manzoni, who in his *Sacred Hymns* endeavored to reconcile religion and liberty, Berchet with his patriotic *Odes,* Leopardi with his fiery *Canzones,* and the gentle Silvio Pellico with his tragedy of *Eufemio di Messina,* wherein Austria discerned a war-cry against the foreigner.

These men, the orators and writers, were the friends of free discussion and of that pacific progress which alone is effective. But others, fanatics of a new creed, moved restlessly in the dark and organized secret societies wherein the impatient dreamed of insurrection and the criminal of assassination. They existed in all forms and under every sort of name, as the Knights of the Sun, the Associates of the Black Pin, the Patriots of 1816, the Vultures of Bonaparte. Some already pos-

sessed an international character which, fifty years later, was destined to manifest other passions and above all other appetites. The " Reformed European Patriots " and the " Friends of Universal Regeneration " proposed to unite the nations against their kings, just as their successors to-day wish without distinction of country to unite the poor against the rich, the workmen against their employers, for the purpose of bringing about a revolution, not indeed in creeds or institutions, but in social order. The most famous was an old Guelph organization, which owed its name to the fact that its members, the Carbonari, met in the depths of the forests in the huts of the charcoal-burners. It covered Italy, France, and Spain, the lands of the Latin tongue. Greece had her " Hetairias " and Poland the " Knights of the Temple " and the " Mowers," when the severity of Alexander impelled the patriots to employ secret societies, the grand engine of the times. Even the victors used the same weapon. They had the Sanfedists in Italy, the Army of the Faith in Spain, the Adelskette in Prussia, the Ferdinandians in Austria, and the Congregation everywhere.

Two societies peculiar to Germany, the Arminia and the Burschenschaft, or Union of Comrades, had succeeded to the Tugendbund, which was dissolved as early as 1815 by those whom it had so powerfully helped to recover or save their crowns. These societies, now that the German land was freed from the foreigner, aimed at causing the disappearance of internal divisions and of the absolute or pseudo-liberal government of its princes. In October, 1817, on the very day when the king of Prussia at Berlin was trying to master the Reformation in order to make of it a great instrument, an instrumentum regni, an immense throng was joyfully celebrating at the Wartburg the third centennial of Protestantism and the anniversary of the battle of Leipzig. Now that religious liberty had been achieved and national independence assured, it demanded the advent of political liberty. It raised the colors of united Germany. It burned in its bonfires of rejoicing those works which opposed philosophical and liberal ideas, as Luther

had burned the papal bulls. "In the sixteenth century," they said, "the Pope was Antichrist; in the nineteenth the despotism of the kings is Antichrist." To this manifestation the princes replied by the suppression of many universities. In the Prussian states alone four universities were closed and "instead of a constitution, Prussia had a countersign."

**Plots. Assassinations. Revolutions** (1816-1822).—Repression produced its customary fruits. Compressed force exploded. This is a law of physics which also exhibits itself in the realms of morals. There is this difference, that when repression acts upon ideas which are in consonance with material needs, it distorts them and renders them all the more formidable. Thus the students were uttering generous sentiments in the open air and in the beer halls. Such public declamation was forbidden. Then they conspired in profound secrecy, and one of them took upon himself the office of assassin. In 1819 Sand stabbed, with the cry, "Vivat Teutonia," a writer who was in the pay of the Holy Alliance. Another tried to kill the president of the regency of Nassau. A few months later, "in order to drain the blood of the Bourbons at its very source," a crazy fanatic, Louvel, knifed the Duke de Berri, who then seemed to be the last heir of the elder branch. Even in London, Thistlewood plotted the murder of fourteen ministers at a dinner given by Lord Harrowby, president of the council.

In all the states of the Holy Alliance conspiracy was the permanent state of affairs, so too in France, Spain, Naples, Turin, the Germanic Confederation, and even in Sweden. From time to time a riot broke out in the barracks or a wine-shop or a university and several heads fell on the scaffold. The governments felt the ground quake beneath them as at the approach of great eruptions. Two countries however, from directly opposite reasons, escaped these subterranean convulsions. Russia repressed them by her ponderous mass, in whose vastness nothing seemed as yet to be in progress of fermentation. The Tsar was then even lavish of promises and liberal reforms in his German or Polish provinces. England had forestalled danger by allowing free

expression to all ideas. Thanks to the right of assembly, English discontent had no need to form secret societies and conspiracies. Thistlewood's plot is exceptional. But meetings were held of 100,000 persons who carried flags whereon were to be read such menacing mottoes as "The Rights of Man," "Universal Suffrage," "Equality." Those tumultuous assemblies occasioned bloody conflicts which compelled the suspension of the law of habeas corpus (1817).

When in 1814 the Spaniards restored to Ferdinand VII the crown, "conquered for him and without him," the deputies of the Cortes went as far as the frontier to meet him, in order to present him with the Constitution of 1812. "Do not forget," they said with the pride of the ancient Aragonese, "that on the day when you violate it, the solemn compact which has made you king will be torn up." A few weeks later Ferdinand tore up this constitution and urged on the reaction with such cruelty that even the members of the Holy Alliance remonstrated with him on the subject. These remonstrances were useless (1817). So plots multiplied with executions, and the isolated cases of recourse to arms were followed by an insurrection of the entire army. Riego at Cadiz and Mina in the Pyrenees proclaimed the Constitution of 1812. Ferdinand, abandoned by everybody, swore fidelity to this Constitution, "since such was the will of the people." On the same day he banished the Jesuits, his counselors. He abolished the Inquisition, whose property was confiscated to extinguish the public debt, and restored the liberty of the press. Thus the two opposite principles, which were contending for the world, met again in what had just fallen and in what had just been raised up in Spain.

The Spanish revolution had its counterpart at Lisbon, in Sicily, and in the Neapolitan kingdom (July) at Benevento and at Ponte Corvo, in the States of the Church, and in Piedmont, whose king abdicated (March, 1821). Many persons were already thinking of constituting an Italian confederation such as Napoleon III afterwards desired, or a kingdom of Italy such as events have made. A parallel movement even spread into Tur-

key, where the Roumanians and Greeks flew to arms (March and April, 1821). The whole south of Europe was returning to liberal ideas. In the rest of the continent the ferment was increasing. On the other side of the Atlantic the Spanish colonies were making themselves independent republics, as the English colonies had done forty years earlier.

Moral contagions are as active as physical contagions. A breath of liberty was blowing over the world. It agitated even venerable England under her Tory ministry and aroused Poland, where the Tsar proceeded from kindness to severity. Alexander established a censorship over everything published in the kingdom (1819). He closed the Diet of 1820 with harsh words and was soon to declare that the Polish nation no longer existed. To these threats Poland immediately replied by the widespread organization of secret societies and every preparation was made for a grand insurrection.

**The Holy Alliance Acts as the Policeman of Europe.**— Thus it appeared that the Holy Alliance was doomed to be vanquished by the mere movement of life in the bosom of the nations. Five years had barely passed over the political edifice so laboriously erected in 1815 and already it was tottering to its fall. To prevent its entire ruin, the congresses of sovereigns multiplied, and Prince Metternich, a man of great skill, assumed the guidance of it. He was the real ruler of Austria. To that state, formed of so many fragments patched together, any shock was dangerous. Therefore Metternich made the status quo the rule of his policy everywhere and in everything. He contrived to instill into the unstable mind of the Tsar Alexander the idea that, after having defended civilization against despotism, he ought to save it from anarchy even though to attain success he should set in motion all the armies of the coalition. It must be confessed that the activity of secret societies and the permanence of conspiracies and assassinations, which disgraced the liberal cause, afforded only too many pretexts for court-martials. Men did not yet comprehend that the best way to make an end of the violent is to satisfy the moderate. So they employed the sword,

which decided nothing, instead of introducing reforms, fitted to conciliate the hostile parties.

Prussia followed in the wake of Austria and Russia. Thus it was easy for Prince Metternich, after winning over the Tsar to his views, to establish harmony between the three Powers. At the Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle (November, 1818) they renewed the alliance of 1815 and bound themselves by conferences, either of these sovereigns or their ministers, to examine questions relative to the maintenance of peace or upon which other governments should formally request their intervention. This idea was more precisely stated later on in the declaration of the Congress of Laibach (February, 1821). "Useful or necessary changes in the legislation and administration of the states are to emanate only from the free will, the enlightened and deliberate impulse, of those whom God has rendered depositaries of power." This was a fresh affirmation of the divine right of kings, with the interpretation that the prince upon whom his people wished to impose that contract called a constitution could summon to his aid his royal colleagues.

The majority of the French royalists were ready to follow this policy, which was that of Pilnitz and the emigrants. This time Great Britain held herself apart. So long as it had been a question of destroying French commerce and French military domination, she had lavished her guineas freely. But she was beginning to be alarmed at the claim, put forth by the continental Powers, to act as the police of Europe in the name of ideas which at bottom only represented interests which might some day or other become inimical to the interests of England. Castlereagh, who seemed to have inherited Pitt's feelings toward France, was obliged to declare in the British Parliament that no Power has the right to interfere in the affairs of another Power, simply because the latter makes changes in its government which do not please the former; and that by electing one's self into a tribunal to judge the affairs of others, one usurps a power which both international law and common sense condemns. In the country, which owed its greatness and its liberty to the national insurrection of 1688, the

friend of Wellington, the leader of the Tories, admitted, while deprecating the revolutionary spirit, "that there are revolutions which are just and necessary."

Thus the two policies, which wrestled all through the nineteenth century, publicly stated their principles. The one policy rejected and the other approved armed intervention. In 1820 England alone upheld the former. As she was alone, she was unable to make it prevail. The Holy Alliance adopted the second, which was nothing more than the continuation of the policy pursued by the European Cabinets ever since 1791.

The Congress of Carlsbad in Bohemia, after the assassination of Kotzebue (1819), was composed only of German ministers. It was decided to place the universities and the press under rigorous surveillance. A commission of inquiry was set up at Mayence, charged with searching out and punishing the enemies of established order. A new congress, which sat for six months in the capital of Austria, studied the means of stifling liberalism. One of these means was to ask from the Pope a bull against secret societies. The final act of the Congress of Vienna (1820) retracted nearly all the concessions which had been made in 1815 in the joy of victory. "As the Germanic Confederation," said Article 57, "has been formed by the sovereigns, the principle of this union requires that all prerogatives of sovereignty shall remain united in the supreme head of the government, and that he shall not be bound to admit the cooperation of the assemblies, except for the exercise of proscribed rights." The Diet of Frankfort was declared to be the sole interpreter of Article 13 of the convention which promised constitutions. It was empowered to employ the confederated troops against all disturbers of public tranquillity, even without the consent of the local governments. The police of the Holy Alliance persecuted the patriots of 1815 as Napoleon had persecuted those of 1807. Newspapers and reviews were suppressed. The philosopher Fries and the naturalist Oken were dismissed. Other professors and students were exiled. Görres was expelled from Prussia; Jahn, Arndt, and Welker were imprisoned.

In France liberal ideas, till then encouraged in a certain degree by Louis XVIII, were held responsible for the assassination of the Duke de Berri by Louvel. The king, swept on by the reaction, was forced to form a new ministry, which caused the government to enter upon the fatal path wherein the throne was wrecked in 1830. Individual liberty was suspended, the censorship of the press restored, and the double vote was introduced so that political influence might pass into the hands of the great landed proprietors, who voted twice, that is, in the college of the department and in the college of the district. The birth of the Duke de Bordeaux (September 29, 1820), the posthumous son of the Duke de Berri; the elections of November, 1820, in which only a few Liberals were chosen to the Chamber; and the death of Napoleon (May 5, 1821), increased the joy and the hopes of the ultra-royalists. Men spoke openly of restoring their ancient prerogatives to the monarchy and the Church. Béranger was condemned to prison for his songs. The University received a stern warning that it was under suspicion when the lectures of Cousin and Guizot were suppressed. Lastly, in order to intimidate the press, journals were placed on trial, not for any definite act of transgression, but on the charge that their tendency was injurious.

These measures tended to reëstablish a superficial calm in the countries which had been the principal theaters of militant liberalism. The Congresses of Troppeau (1820), Laibach (1821), and Verona (1822) aimed at stifling liberalism in the two peninsulas where it had just triumphed. They refused to discriminate between legitimate complaints and inopportune demands. The revolutions in Greece, Spain, Naples, and Turin were represented in a circular note "as being the same in origin and deserving the same fate." If no measures were taken against the Greeks, it was because Russia was interested in that revolt of her co-religionists whereby she obtained allies at the very heart of the Ottoman Empire. In Italy Austria undertook to destroy "the false doctrines and the criminal associations which have brought down upon rebellious nations the sword of jus-

tice." A numerous army, to be followed at need by 100,000 Russians, set out from Venetian Lombardy. At Rieti and Novara the recruits of Pepe and of Santa Rosa could not stand against the veterans of the Napoleonic wars, and the Austrians entered Naples, Turin, and Messina. Behind them the prisons were filled and scaffolds erected. Austria lent her prisons as well as her soldiers. The dungeons of Venice, Laibach, and the Spielberg were crowded with victims, but there was a still larger number in the native prisons. There were 16,000 at one time in the cells of the Two Sicilies. In Piedmont all the leaders who had been captured were beheaded. Those who escaped were executed in effigy. No insurrection had really broken out in the States of the Church, but four hundred persons were incarcerated there. Many of them were condemned to the death penalty, which the Pope commuted into perpetual or temporary confinement. The Piedmontese Silvio Pellico, imprisoned at first at Venice and then in the Spielberg, has narrated with a martyr's calmness what tortures this pitiless policy added to his captivity.

After the executions administrative measures and a clever police maintained external order. The king of Sardinia reëstablished forced labor (1824) and permitted no persons to learn to read unless they possessed property to the value of 1500 francs (1825). To demonstrate his zeal for the Church he ordered a fresh and equally useless persecution against the peaceable Waldenses. The Pope reëstablished episcopal jurisdiction in civil affairs, restored the right of asylum to churches, and from hatred of all novelties suppressed even the Vaccination Commission as a revolutionary institution. When Leo XII succeeded Pius VII (1823), a violent encyclical condemned civil marriage, and excited the kings to intolerance. Rome set the example. The Inquisition opened a new prison, which was immediately filled with heretics (1825). The king of Naples, Francis I, almost absolutely interdicted the entrance of foreign books, so as to establish a sort of sanitary cordon around his kingdom, and cause his peoples to recover in their isolation their holy ignorance. Then he hired ten thousand Swiss mer-

cenaries to assure the collection of the taxes and the obedience of his subjects, the two chief anxieties of his government. Wherever there was material welfare, a formidable spy system wormed its way into the midst of social relations and even into the privacy of the domestic hearth.

The spirit of the century desired three things. These were free institutions, equality before the law, and national independence. To the first two demands the Holy Alliance replied by reverting to the principles of pure monarchy and of the feudal system. To the third the answer was the disdainful remark of Metternich, "Italy is only a geographical expression," or that of the Tsar Alexander, "The Polish nationality is nonsense."

In 1823 this policy seemed successful. There were fewer conspiracies and no more assassinations. The insurrections were crushed at one of the points where, because there the people and the army had entered into them, they had been most threatening. With her docile lieutenants seated on the different thrones of Italy, with her army of occupation at all the strategical points, with her numerous spies and the assistance of the Holy Father, Austria did in fact believe that she had effected the durable work of restoration. To her allies she pointed with pride at that peninsula, formerly so distracted, where, from the base of the Alps to the Straits of Messina, she had brought about the silence of death. Then the Holy Alliance thought of undertaking the same task beyond the Pyrenees. There all passions had been let loose. Reactionaries, crucifix in hand, were murdering their enemies, and, meanwhile, the rabble were cutting throats to the revolutionary song of the *Tragala*.

To lull the suspicions which France had for a moment inspired by her hesitation at Austrian intervention in Italy, the government of Louis XVIII asked permission to stifle the disorders in Spain. Chateaubriand, who was then minister, believed that this expedition would confer upon the young fleurs de lis of the Restoration the splendor with which fifty victories had crowned the imperial eagles. England, where the irritation was increasing at the claims of the Holy Alliance to govern

Europe, held aloof. Wellington, her ambassador at Verona, would allow France nothing more than an army of observation along the Spanish frontier. Canning, who, since the suicide of Castlereagh, had become the British prime minister, threatened in open Parliament to recognize the independence of the Spanish American colonies as retaliation for the French expedition.

The army, commanded by the Duke of Angoulême, entered Spain on April 7, 1823. It had little opportunity for fighting and encountered no serious resistance except at the siege of Cadiz. On August 31 the French troops took possession after a brilliant assault of the stronghold of the Trocadero, and this success brought about the surrender of the city. Although fighting for the despot Ferdinand, the French army carried its liberal spirit to Spain. The Duke of Angoulême, by the ordinance of Andujar, sought to forestall the fury of a royalist reaction and to prevent arbitrary arrests and executions. But Ferdinand had no intention of permitting his saviors to impose conditions. The military commissions were implacable. Riego, grievously wounded, was carried to the gibbet on a hurdle drawn by an ass. A counter revolution took place at Lisbon as well as Madrid. The king declared the constitution abolished and for a few months reëstablished absolute power.

Despite the congratulations sent by the princes and the Pope to the honest but commonplace prince who had just conducted this easy campaign, the elder branch of the Bourbons had won in it little military glory. Most apparent in this expedition was the fact that French soldiers had been placed at the service of a knavish and cruel prince and French finances depleted by an expenditure of 200,000,000 francs. Still, petty as was this success, it encouraged the French ministry in their reactionary projects. The elections increased this confidence, only nineteen Liberals obtaining seats in the Chamber.

**Charles X** (1824).—The death of Louis XVIII, a prudent and moderate king, seemed to assure the triumph of the ultra-royalists, by transferring the power to the Count d'Artois (September 16, 1824). He was

one of those people who gain nothing from experience. In 1789 this prince had been among the first to emigrate. While learning nothing, he had forgotten nothing. Louis XVIII on his death-bed, placing his hand on the head of the Duke de Bordeaux, said to him, "Let Charles X look out for this child's crown," but he had paid no heed. He felt himself called upon to revive the ancient monarchy. "In France," he said, "the king consults the Chambers. He pays great heed to their advice and their remonstrances; but, when the king is not persuaded, his will must be done." These words were a denial of the charter and an intimation of its speedy violation. At the very beginning of his reign he asked from the Chambers an indemnity of $200,000,000 for the emigrants, the reëstablishment of convents for women, the restoration of the rights of primogeniture, a rigorous law against the press and another concerning offenses committed in churches. The latter was called the law of sacrilege. The new Chamber of extremists accorded everything. There was no resistance, except in the Chamber of Peers, which by its opposition won a few days of popularity.

In May, 1825, the new monarch revived the solemnity of coronation with all traditional ceremony, with the ancient oath and with touching for the king's evil. A popular manifestation was the response to this royal and religious festival. General Foy, a leader of the Liberal party, had just died. One hundred thousand persons followed his bier, and a national subscription provided for the future of his children.

## PROGRESS OF LIBERAL IDEAS

**The Romantic School. The Sciences.**—Nevertheless liberal opinions were gaining ground every day and opposition to the spirit of the Congregation was increasing. Voltaire seemed alive again, there were so many editions of his works. Béranger was in every hand, and the people wanted to see *Tartuffe* played in every theater.

In letters and arts a great movement was to be noted. This movement was in the direction of liberty, for it ran counter to discipline and traditions. The almost volcanic eruption of the romantic school (1825-1830) overwhelmed worn-out formulas and emitted dazzling light, despite its scoria and ashes. Goethe and Schiller, Shakespeare and Byron, had been the forerunners of the new men of letters. They had even been precursors of those artists who, in their search for fresh expressions of the beautiful, gave the human mind a salutary shock and aided the work of statesmen in advancing society. Thierry, Guizot, De Barante, Mignet, and Michelet reformed history. Cousin and Jouffroy reformed philosophy. Hugo, Lamartine, De Vigny, Dumas, Musset, and Balzac reformed poetry, the drama, and romance. Villemain and Sainte-Beuve reformed literary criticism. Géricault, Delacroix, Ary Scheffer, and Delaroche reformed painting. David d'Angers and Rude reformed sculpture. The overthrow of the ancient classical system rendered still more difficult the victory of the ancient social system.

Learned letters also enlarged their horizon. Champollion forced the Egyptian Sphinx to speak. De Sacy and De Remusat lifted some of the veils which hid the Orient. Guigiaut began the publication of Creuzer's *Symbologism and Mythology,* and made the religions of antiquity comprehensible. All this meant new ideas put into general circulation.

The sciences continued their serene and majestic march, and added great names to the list of honor. There were Poisson, Ampère, Fresnel, Cauchy, Chasles, Arago, Biot, and Dulong in mathematics and physics; Gay-Lussac, Thénard, Chevreul, and Dumas in chemistry; Cuvier, Geoffroy Saint Hilaire, Brongniart, De Jessieu, and Élie de Beaumont in the natural sciences. By the successful efforts of so many superior men, natural philosophy mastered truths whose application to manufactures by creating new interests aided also to transform society. The lighthouses of Fresnel began to illuminate the coasts and guided vessels thirty-five miles out at sea (1822). The steamboats of the Marquis de

Jouffroy, kindred spirit with Watt and Fulton, appeared on the French rivers and in their ports (1825). The company of Saint Étienne laid the first French railway (1827). Two years later Séguin d'Annonay constructed the tubular locomotive. The discoveries of Oersted (1820) and of Ampère and Arago (1822) indicated the electric telegraph.

Thus, during those fruitful years (1815-1830) were brought into being the great inventions of railways and steamers which have transformed the commerce of the world. This immense advance had no direct connection with politics; but they who brought it to pass thereby increased confidence in the might of human genius. They accustomed men's minds to severe methods of scientific investigation. They showed what are the necessary conditions of truth. Thereby they contributed, some of them unconsciously, to the development in modern civilization of that reasoning spirit which was a main force of liberal opinion.

**Formation in France of a Legal Opposition.**—In the Chamber men of talent or authority, like Chateaubriand, Royer-Collard, De Broglie, Pasquier, De Barante, Molé, and Benjamin Constant served the cause of public liberty. Serious journals, like the *Globe*, the *Censeur*, the *Débats*, the *Constitutionnel*, and the *Courrier Français*, founded a new power in the state, that of the press, and defended it before the public, while higher education popularized it in the schools. The French Academy itself protested against the proposed law which aimed at suppressing the freedom of periodicals.

In short, ten years of peace had afforded commerce and manufactures an opportunity to expand. The public finances were economically administered and the country was rapidly replacing the capital which had been destroyed by war, invasion, and indemnities. But amidst the general prosperity there were manifestations of that nervous impatience to which France is subject after a prolonged calm has made her forget the ruins caused by the great commotions which appall her, and which down to the present day seem congenial to her strange national temperament.

Even social questions began to be agitated. As philosophy and religion, those two ancient teachers of the human race, had no new lessons to impart to the fresh life upon which the world was entering through manufactures and politics, dreamers attempted to take their place. The Count de Saint Simon issued his *New Christianity,* in which he formulated the famous principle: "To each man according to his capacity; to each capacity according to its works." This doctrine was not calculated to please the favorites of birth and fortune. Many extravagances were destined to spring from the little church which the Saint Simonians tried to found. The teachings of their master, of Robert Owen in England, and of Fourier in France, gave birth to strange utopias which, after covertly working their way beneath official society, broke out in the frightful civil wars of 1848 and 1871, and went on in the workshop after the tumult had ceased in the street. Some ideas of those theorists would have made humanity retrograde, since they wished to render the state the absolute master in even industrial and private life. Still they turned men's attention to new problems, which a sentiment of equity commands us to study even if the wisdom of the legislator cannot solve them. Already men were to be found who, quarreling with society as a whole, with its laws and its religion, undertook to overturn everything. As yet they were only solitary dreamers. Later on sinister figures will appear with violent passions and monstrous appetites. At that moment the extravagance of some of their doctrines excited laughter rather than uneasiness in the crowded ranks, where to demand from the government a more liberal policy seemed sufficient.

The country was with the Liberals. After May 5, 1821, Bonapartism, placing little confidence in the son of Napoleon, then a half prisoner in Vienna, and not yet sure of his nephew, Prince Louis, existed rather as a memory than a hope. In the influential class the Republic found but few advocates. Socialism was rather a doctrine than a party. Thus the real masters of the situation were the Liberals, who were ready to rally round the dynasty if it broke with the Congregation

and with the men of 1815. On their side were the merchants, who do not love the privileged by birth; the burgher class, which rails as soon as it ceases to fear; the persecuted opponents of the Congregation, and all those people who in the cities are hostile to any government, and in the rural districts are afraid of seeing tithes and feudal rights restored. The great cities were in opposition, and Paris most of all. At a review of the national guard in April, 1827, the cry, "Down with the ministers," rang through the ranks. That very evening the national guard was disbanded. Under the circumstances this measure was necessary, but it estranged the burgher class from the court. To overcome the opposition of the upper Chamber seventy-six peers were created at once. But a general election was imprudently provoked which sent to the Chamber a Liberal majority. The Conservative ministry fell from office (December, 1827).

A few years earlier the various elements of opposition had agitated only by secret societies and plots, resulting in riots and assassinations which injured the cause of liberty. But now in gradually enlightened public opinion a far more formidable foe to the ancient system of government had arisen. A great Liberal party, organizing and disciplining itself, introduced legal opposition at the very heart of the government into the two Chambers, and thence it was to force an entrance into the ministry. Thus, with definite ideas men were marching openly to their goal without either rash deeds or violence, accepting the royalty of the Bourbons, but requiring of them "to make the Charter a truth." The accession of Monsieur de Martignac to the presidency of the Council seemed a reason for believing that France would escape disasters by necessary reforms at the proper time. His ministry abolished censorship of the press and sought to prevent the electoral frauds which preceding ministries had favored. It asserted the liberty of conscience, which had formerly been menaced, reopened at the Sorbonne the courses of lectures which the Congregation had closed, and placed under one common system the educational establishments controlled by ecclesiastics. This was only a beginning. Nevertheless it was easy to infer

that the country was again returning to the era of pacific progress, from which the assassination of the Duke de Berri and a reactionary ministry had caused it to depart.

The general condition of the world, which must always be taken into account in any endeavor to discover resistless movements of public opinion, confirmed this hope, for the ancient system was everywhere on the retreat.

**Huskisson and Canning in England** (1822). **New Foreign Policy. Principle of Non-Intervention.**—Beginning with 1822 the Tories, or rather the Tory policy, had lost the direction of English affairs. The most influential minister, George Canning, the pupil of William Pitt, had just gone over to the Whigs. England, irritated by the arrogant interference of the northern courts in every continental matter, was beginning to restrain her former allies by favoring the ideas which they combated. In 1823 Canning caused the presidency of the Board of Trade to be given to Huskisson, whose customs reforms opened great breaches in that tariff fortress, behind which the aristocracy sheltered their privileges and fortunes. This economical revolution was dictated by the liberal spirit, and because of its consequences was far more serious than many a political revolution. It was destined, step by step, to control all the industrial world; to give work to the poor, comfort to many, and the habit and necessity of individual and untrammeled action to all.

Ireland was a prey to frightful misery, the result of atrocious legislation. "The wigwam of the Indian in the New World," said one deputy, "is more habitable than the hut of the poor Irishman. I have seen the peasants of Kerry offer to work for twopence a day." This state of things could not change until the day when the representatives of that unhappy country were able to plead her cause in Parliament. But the Roman Catholic Irish were smitten with political disability. The lords rejected the bill in their behalf which the Commons had accepted. But two years after Canning's last speech in their favor, Robert Peel was himself compelled to propose and pass the Catholic Relief Bill (1829). In

1817 Parliament, at the pious instigation of Wilberforce, had voted for the abolition of the slave-trade. Men now desired that, like the Convention, it should decree the emancipation of the slaves. Canning rejected immediate emancipation, but proposed such amelioration as made the slave a man and opened to him the door of liberty. That humane law of 1825 led a few years later to the suppression of slavery (1833).

Thus the English Parliament allowed itself to be affected by generous ideas. Still, that great body rightly was not regarded as sufficiently liberal. The aristocracy held the House of Lords by the hereditary rights of its older sons. It held the House of Commons by its younger sons and its dependents, seats for whom it obtained by means of rotten boroughs. Twelve families controlled 100 seats at Westminster, and sometimes sold them for cash. One village of seven houses sent two members to the House. Gatton and Old Sarum belonged to one landed proprietor, who elected the representative himself, while the great city of Manchester possessed neither elector nor deputy. The powerful Birmingham Union was formed to rouse the country on the double question of parliamentary reform and abolition of the corn laws, so as to secure cheaper bread. Of these two reforms, the one was effected in 1832, but the other had to wait until 1846. Thus under the influence of the new spirit old England was being transformed, without disturbance and through free discussion. The prosperity of the country gained thereby. As early as 1824 Canning was able to diminish the taxes $10,000,000, create a sinking-fund for the public debt, and reduce the customs-duties on rum, coal, silks, and woolens. These measures favored manufactures, commerce, and the rising public credit.

Foreign policy was assuming the same character. In 1821 England had resigned herself to the intervention of Austria in Italian affairs; but in 1823, at the Congress of Verona, she was already opposing the French expedition against the constitutional party of Madrid, although still showing the latter nothing but barren sympathy. The irritation against the Holy Alliance was on the increase; so when the allies, in order to include

the New World in their sphere of action, had the French ambassador, M. de Polignac, propose to Canning that they should discuss the means of putting down the rebellion of the Spanish colonies, the minister replied: "If any power assists Spain to recover her transmarine provinces, England will take measures to protect her own interests." To her it was not a question of sentiment, and we must not consider her policy more generous than it was. Nor did France intend to close the immense market which was opened to her by the independence and free trade of the Spanish colonies.

However, the policy of the future gained by the definite and even threatening affirmation of the principle of non-intervention. Without ranging herself on the side of democracy, England meant that governments should be left to extricate themselves as best they could from the difficulties which their own violation of national ideas and interests might bring upon them.

**Independence of the Spanish Colonies** (1824). **Constitutional Empire of Brazil** (1822). **Liberal Revolution in Portugal** (1826).—Spain had subjected her transatlantic provinces to a system which inevitably brought about revolt. All manufactures, all foreign commerce, and many branches of agriculture, including cultivation of the vine, had been forbidden the colonists. They were bound to obtain from their mountains the gold and silver which the galleons bore away to Spain, and to receive from the mother country all manufactured articles, including even iron and building timber. In short, Spanish America was a farm worked to the uttermost by its proprietor, the government of Madrid. Inhuman penalties upheld this unnatural state of affairs. The smuggler was punished with death, and the Inquisition placed its religious authority and its tribunals at the service of this strange economical despotism. Insurrection broke out in Mexico in 1810, when the French invasion of Spain prevented the mother country from supporting its viceroys. The revolt spread from one province to another. In 1816 the countries composing the viceroyalty of La Plata proclaimed their independence. In the following year Chili followed this example. Toward

1821 Peru, Colombia, Central America, and Mexico became free; and the Spaniards retained only a few points in the New World, together with the islands of Cuba and Porto Rico. As no one foresaw the unhappy dissensions into which these young republics were to fall, this defeat of absolutism in the New World reacted upon public opinion in the Old and the liberal cause was strengthened thereby. One of the heroes of independence, Bolivar the Liberator, was almost as popular in Paris as in Caracas. Two others, San Martin and O'Higgins, are on the world's everlasting roll of fame.

The Congress of Washington speedily recognized the new states. In 1822 England was disposed to do the same, although an Act of Parliament in 1819 had forbidden English subjects to furnish munitions of war to the insurgents. The French expedition beyond the Pyrenees decided her, toward the end of 1824, to send diplomatic agents to Spanish America and to ask commercial treaties from the new states. In order to justify his new policy, Canning addressed to the European Powers a circular note in which he repudiated the doctrine of Pilnitz, still the basis of the Holy Alliance. He tried to eliminate from the wars against France their original character, which was that of two hostile principles in hand-to-hand conflict. He set forth only the character they had assumed later on as a struggle for the independence of the states. He claimed that the coalition was formed against imperial ambition and not, out of respect for legitimacy, against the government actually established in France. And he recalled with cruel malice that in 1814, even after having deposed Napoleon from the throne, the allies had thought of bestowing the conquered crown upon another than a Bourbon.

In 1826 and 1827 England made a fresh application of these doctrines, but this time on the European continent, and consequently nearer to inflammable materials.

Imperial France, without designing it, had given liberty to Spanish and Portuguese America by overturning at Madrid and Lisbon the two governments which held their colonies in such strict dependence. Brazil was still subject to the unnatural severity of the old colonial sys-

zem when the house of Braganza, driven from the banks of the Tagus by the army of Junot (1808), took refuge there. The king, whom his colony sheltered and saved, was obliged to remove the ancient prohibitions and inaugurate a liberal system which, under the form of royalty (1815) and then of a constitutional empire (1822), guaranteed to those immense provinces internal peace and growing prosperity. The mother country was unwilling, after the fall of Napoleon and the return of her former king, to be left behind. John VI was obliged, in 1820, to grant Portugal a constitution which the intrigues of his second son, Dom Miguel, and the defeat of the Spanish Liberals (1823) caused to be torn up.

At the death of John VI (1826), Dom Pedro, the eldest son of that prince, the ex-emperor of Brazil and legitimate heir of the Portuguese throne, again abdicated that crown in favor of his daughter Doña Maria. But first he granted a new constitution. The absolutists on the banks of the Tagus and of the Douro, supported by those of Spain, rejected both the Charter and the child-queen. Portugal was both a farm and a market for Great Britain. Many Englishmen possessed vast territories there. Its wines went to London and its manufactured goods came from England. An absolutist victory at Lisbon appeared to Canning as a defeat for English influence and English interests. He promised assistance to the Portuguese regency. On December 11, 1826, he announced to Parliament the measures which had been taken to that end. His speech made a great sensation, because for the first time since 1815 a great Power stated in public, and with truth, the moral condition of Europe. Canning recalled the fact that when France had crossed the Pyrenees to restore to Ferdinand VII the powers of which his subjects had deprived him, England, without an army, without foolish expenditure, had wrested a hemisphere from this restored monarch; that, in a word, she had with one stroke of the pen reëstablished the balance of the Old World by giving existence to the New. His country was not ignorant, he said, how many hearts and energetic arms, in their desire for what is best, were stretched out toward it. This force was that of a giant.

The duty of England was to make the champions of exaggerated sentiments feel that their interest lay in not making such an empire their enemy. England in the conflict of opinions which agitated the world was in the position of the master of winds. She held in her hands the leathern bottles of Æolus. With a single word she could let loose the hurricane upon the world. These threats were directly leveled at the Holy Alliance. They disturbed Prince Metternich, who accused the English minister of wishing "to unchain the Revolution once more," but in every country they rejoiced the heart of the Liberals. A medal, struck in France in honor of Canning, bore on one side these words, "Civil and Religious Liberty in all the Universe"; and on the other side, "In the name of the nations, the French to George Canning."

The motto told the truth. It certainly was for two great things, civil liberty and religious liberty, or the rights of the citizen and the rights of conscience, that mankind had engaged in the great combat; and our fathers were right to wage it.

The intervention of England in Portugal, "authorized by former treaties," was nevertheless far less striking than the eloquence of her minister. The enterprises of Dom Miguel, arrested for a time, had free course after the premature death of Canning (August 8, 1827), which was speedily followed by the return to power of the Tories. Further on we shall see this question solved by the triumph of a new policy among the western Powers.

**Liberation of Greece** (1827).—A few days before his death Canning signed the Treaty of London, by which three of the great Powers bound themselves to compel the Sultan to recognize the independence of the Greeks.

The insurrection of that people, long favored by Russia and rendered inevitable by Turkish cruelty, broke out in 1820. The governments condemned it at first. The English government opposed it because that struggle compromised the existence of Turkey, on whose preservation apparently depended the security of its Indian empire. "British liberalism," said Chateaubriand, "wears

the liberty cap in Mexico and the turban at Athens." As for the Holy Alliance, it saw in this insurrection nothing but a rebellion.

By 1826 public opinion in Europe had become irresistible in favor of the Hellenes. All liberal Europe espoused a cause heroically maintained for national independence and religion. Sympathy was excited, even among the Conservatives, by that magic name of Greece, by the struggle of Christians against Mussulmans. In France the finger of scorn would have stigmatized anyone who did not applaud the exploits of Odysseus, Botsaris, Canaris, and Miaoulis, the audacious chieftains who led their palikaris into the thickest ranks of the janissaries and their fire-ships to the heart of the Mussulman squadrons. Poetry came to the succor of the insurgents. Lord Byron devoted to them his fortune and his life. The politicians were forced to follow the current. Canning easily involved England. Beholding Italy subject to Austrian influence, Spain restored to friendly relations with France, and the East agitated by Russian intrigues or threatened by her arms, England was growing uneasy as the northern Powers thus approached the shores of the Mediterranean whither enormous trade was on the point of returning. She had many formidable vantage points in that sea, in Gibraltar, Malta, and the Ionian Isles. But they were fortresses and not provinces. From them she could watch and not control. It was of vital importance to England not to allow the Romanoffs to dominate at Nauplia and Constantinople, as the Hapsburgs were dominating at Naples, Rome, and Milan, or the Bourbons at Madrid.

To forestall an armed intervention, which the Russians were already preparing, the British minister tried to settle everything himself by making the two parties accept his mediation. In March, 1826, Sir Stratford Canning, cousin of the prime minister, thought that, merely by the pressure of England, he was on the point of wresting from the Porte and imposing upon the Greeks a pacific solution. He asked the one party to renounce their "grand idea" of replacing the cross of Constantine upon Sancta Sophia and to be content

at first with having a small but free country. To the Ottomans he said that the body of the empire would be strengthened by the amputation of a limb in which a germ of death was endangering the whole state. By this double-faced policy England reckoned upon keeping as her friends both the adversaries whom she had reconciled. But the Divan, deceived by the successes of the Egyptian army which had just captured Missolonghi and which held nearly the whole Morea, haughtily rejected these conditions. So the only resource was to reach an understanding with the Tsar for common action, or else see him reap alone the reward of isolated action.

France, the protectress of the Roman Catholics in the Levant, could not hold aloof. Austria, whom every movement terrified, remained inactive, awaiting events and husbanding her strength. Prussia was then too remote to interfere. Thus the three Powers, France, Russia, and England, bound themselves by the Treaty of London (July 6, 1827) to put an end to the war of extermination which had been carried into the Peloponnesus by Ibrahim Pasha, son of the viceroy of Egypt. The three allied squadrons burned the Ottoman fleet in the Bay of Navarino (October 20, 1827). Over this easy success far too much noise was made, and in his speech at the opening of Parliament the king of England deplored its occurrence. As the Sultan did not yet yield the Russians, who had just conquered Persian Armenia, declared war against him (April 26, 1828). Fifteen thousand Frenchmen disembarked in the Morea to aid in settling as quickly as possible this Greek question, so small at the beginning but now able to give rise to the most dreaded complications.

**Destruction of the Janissaries** (1826). **Success of the Russians** (1828-1829).—The Ottomans were incapable of resistance. Sultan Mahmoud had just exterminated the janissaries, a lawless militia, which had deposed or strangled several sultans, but had also victoriously carried the green standard from Buda to Bagdad. The corps had been corrupted by many abuses, which it defended by constant rebellions. This soldiery refused to

drill or to obey, and Mahmoud mowed them down with grape-shot. Between the sixteenth and the twenty-second of June, 1826, in Constantinople alone 10,000 janissaries were slain by cannon or the bowstring, or burned alive in their barracks. Those in the provinces were hunted down in every direction.

The Sultan had destroyed the inefficient but only military force of the empire before organizing another. The Russians made rapid progress, capturing Silistria in June, 1829, Erzeroum in July, and Adrianople in August. The Turkish Empire seemed crumbling to pieces. Austria, trembling as the Russians approached the gates of Stamboul, joined France and England in imposing peace upon Nicholas. The latter, in spite of a visit to Berlin, could not obtain the effective assistance of Prussia. So, on September 14, 1829, he accepted the Treaty of Adrianople, which compelled restoration of his conquests. Nevertheless it gave him the mouths of the Danube, the right for his fleets to navigate the Black Sea, thus facilitating a direct attack upon Constantinople, and the protectorate over Moldavia, Wallachia, and Servia. The first two provinces were to be henceforth governed by hospodars for life and the last by a hereditary prince. This treaty, which saved Turkey, handed over the Danubian principalities to Russian influence. But the allies hoped that the new Greek state, converted into a monarchy in 1831, would serve them as a basis of operations to counteract the diplomacy of the Tsar in the Eastern peninsula.

**Summary. State of the World in 1828.**—Without any violent revolution, but in consequence of the persevering efforts of wise men, France with Martignac, England with Canning, and Portugal through Dom Pedro, took up again liberal traditions. To them Spain was to be led back by a change in the law of succession. In the New World ten republics were born and the only monarchy which remained there had become constitutional. On the old continent the new Hellenic state, the work of sentiment as much as of politics, had taken its place among the nations on the side of free institutions. In Italy, especially at Milan and Rome, in Germany, Hesse,

Baden, Brunswick, and Saxony a portentous fermentation announced to unpopular governments that revolutions could only be prevented by reforms. In Belgium and in Poland, under the lead of the clergy, the insurrection of nationalities and of religions was preparing which antagonistic religions and nationalities wished to smother. And lastly, commerce and manufactures, which had been developed in the calm of peace, letters, which were animated by a breath of renewal, and the periodical press, which was becoming a power, all favored the advance of public spirit toward popular independence and individual liberty. Thus, everything warned the governments to keep in that great liberal current which was traversing the world from one pole to the other, from Paris to Lima. Unfortunately there were princes and ministers who tried once more to resist that force which some call Providence or fate, and which to others is the irresistible result of a thousand causes, great or small, by which the common life of a nation and of humanity is determined.

## NEW AND IMPOTENT EFFORTS OF THE OLD RÉGIME AGAINST THE LIBERAL SPIRIT

**Dom Miguel in Portugal** (1828). **Don Carlos in Spain** (1827).—Absolutism, astonished and uneasy after its reverses, made a supreme effort to regain possession of the countries which had just broken from its control. The signal was given by Vienna, which, under the direction of Prince Metternich, was the citadel of reaction. Dom Miguel had taken refuge there and from it kept Portugal in a state of incessant agitation, hoping to dethrone his niece, Doña Maria, then a child of seven. Dom Pedro had believed he could save his daughter's throne by marrying her to Dom Miguel and investing him with the regency. The regent swore fidelity to the constitution (February 22, 1828), but four months afterwards proclaimed himself king. This perjury and usurpation was supported by the English Tories and

seemed successful at first. Despotism terrorized the country. The victims of assassination, execution, or banishment were numbered by thousands (1829).

Dom Miguel was the son of a sister of Ferdinand VII. The nephew was as bad as the uncle, and the king of Spain had given bloody pledges to the absolutists. Nevertheless the friend of the Jesuits was deemed too liberal. In 1825 Bessières, an adventurer of French origin, took up arms "to deliver the king held captive by the negroes" or Constitutionals. In 1827 the former soldiers of the Army of the Faith proclaimed his brother, Don Carlos, the leader of the clerical party, as king. This attempt did not succeed: but it was the beginning of an interminable war. Dom Miguel had rebelled two or three times against his father. The representatives of the old régime, the Apostolicals, as they called themselves in Spain, were accordingly as revolutionary as their adversaries of 1820. It will not be surprising to find soon this same contempt for law in the spirit and acts of their friends in France.

**The Wellington Ministry** (1828). **The Diet of Frankfort.**—Some time after the death of Canning the Tories returned to power with the Wellington ministry and tried to give a different direction to the policy of Great Britain. Zeal for the cause of Greece immediately slackened. The protection accorded the Portuguese Liberals was withdrawn. Wellington recalled the English corps which had been sent to the Tagus, stopped by main force an expedition of Constitutionals, and recognized Dom Miguel as king (1829). At home the importation of foreign grain was discouraged. The emancipation of the Roman Catholic Irish was opposed although O'Connell, "the great agitator," had already begun to stir the masses with the cry, "Justice for Ireland." Liberal opinion gained strength. In the following year it carried the Irish Bill. Lord John Russell, the Whig leader, succeeded in passing a resolution which made it no longer incumbent on all candidates for offices under the crown to prove that they received the sacrament according to the rites of the Anglican Church. Hitherto all except Episcopalians had been excluded from office. Thus the

Tories were obliged to bow before the current which was flowing toward free institutions.

Italy, in the stern grasp of Austria, no longer made any movement, and Germany was becoming equally silent. "Since 1815," wrote a Prussian ambassador, the personal friend of his king, "since 1815 we have lived weighed down with heavy chains. We have beheld all voices stifled, even those of the poets, and we have been reduced to seeking refuge in the sanctuary of science." Nevertheless, reforms in material interests were accomplished. The Zollverein was introduced, which suppressed internal customs-duties.

But in defiance of the independence of the Confederated States, the Diet of Frankfort in 1824 renewed its declaration that it would everywhere uphold royalty. That was saying in effect that for the simplest reforms the Liberals would be obliged to conquer the resistance of their respective sovereigns and of the armies of the entire Confederation, since the latter was self-appointed judge of whatever acts might compromise "the monarchical principle." The law was continued which in 1819 had established rigorous penalties against the press for a period of five years. A commission was further charged with "examining defects in instruction," so as to subject the rising generation to an education in keeping with the spirit of the Holy Alliance. Lastly, as the debates of the Diet, hitherto public, seemed to disturb men's minds, the assembly decided to hold its deliberations in future only behind closed doors. The federal government hid itself in the shadow like the inquisitors of Venice. Alexander adopted the same measures with regard to the Polish Diet (1825).

**The Tsar Nicholas.**—In Russia the nation was summed up in one man, the Tsar. The prohibition issued by Alexander against bringing into Russia any books which treated of politics "in a manner hostile to the principles of the Holy Alliance" had been a hindrance to very few readers. But the moral contagion, which cannot be kept out by a line of custom-houses, crossed the frontier, and the new ideas gained a meager following here and there. Alexander's last moments were darkened by the

discovery of a formidable conspiracy which extended even to the army. "What harm have I done them?" he exclaimed sadly. No harm except in seeking to be the intelligence and will of 60,000,000 souls. Even in Russia there were already men who believed that that rôle was ended.

When Alexander died at Taganrog (December, 1825), his brother, the Grand Duke Constantine, voluntarily repeated his renunciation of the crown. Nicholas, a third son of Paul II, was proclaimed Tsar. He was a man of iron, no harder to others than to himself. Convinced that he was a representative of the divine will, he consequently acted with perfect calmness, whether ordering the punishment of an individual, the execution of a people, or a war which was to carry off a million men. The plots formed under Alexander were not abandoned. Some of the conspirators aimed at overthrowing Tsarism by uniting all the Slavic population in one federal republic, like the United States. Others thought to force its surrender by imposing upon it a constitution. They brought over many regiments to their cause. On the day when the garrison of St. Petersburg was to take the oath to the new ruler, the sedition broke out. Before nightfall it was crushed. After a few executions in the provinces, Russia recognized her master in that prince who for a quarter of a century was to Europe the haughty and all-powerful incarnation of autocracy.

**The Polignac Ministry** (1829). **Capture of Algiers.**—Thus in Germany, Russia, and the Iberian and Italian peninsulas, the liberal spirit was again repressed. The allies of 1815 seemed to have conquered once more. In Great Britain it was awakening, but under the prudent guardianship of the Tories. Hitherto it had been the privilege of France to move the world. To which side would she incline? If she were able to continue her liberal evolution peacefully, the new light would shine abroad without a shock and with a penetrating force well-nigh irresistible.

So long as M. de Martignac remained in the government the Liberals retained their hopes. Unhappily Charles X, docile to the counsels of the Congregation,

supported his minister without liking him. After eighteen months his self-control was exhausted. On August 8, 1829, taking advantage of a slight rebuff imprudently inflicted by the Chamber on his ministers in a matter of minor importance, he replaced them by Messieurs De Polignac, De Labourdonnaie, and De Bourmont. The choice of such men by the monarch amounted to a declaration of war against the country. A crisis was inevitable. For ten months the opposition press constantly repeated that the government would end of necessity by a coup d'état, and the deputies declared in their address of reply to the king's speech, that the ministry did not possess their confidence. The Chamber was dissolved, but the 221 signers of the address were reëlected. Royalty, vanquished in the elections, decided to make its own revolution.

The military success of the Algerian expedition encouraged this resolve. Thirty-seven thousand French troops, under the Count de Bourmont, had landed in Africa to avenge an affront to a French consul and had taken possession of the country and city of Algiers. The booty seized defrayed the cost of the expedition. Since that time Algeria has been a possession of France.

**The Revolution of 1830.**—On the 26th of July ordinances appeared which annulled the liberty of the press, rendered the last elections void, and created a new electoral system. This was a coup d'état against public liberty. It overthrew the charter, on which the return of the Bourbons to the throne of their fathers had been conditioned. The magistrates declared these ordinances illegal. Paris replied to the provocation of the court by the three days of July 27, 28, and 29, 1830. This time resistance was legitimate, since both the burghers and populace fought those who had infringed the constitution. Despite the bravery of the royal guard and of the Swiss, Charles X was vanquished. When he offered to withdraw the ordinances and then abdicated in favor of his grandson, the Duke de Bordeaux, he was answered by the watchword of all revolutions, "It is too late." He again went into exile. Six thousand men had been slain or wounded. They were victims to the obsti-

nacy of an old man, who, in the words of Royer-Collard, "had set up his government counter to society as if it existed against society, as if to give society the lie and defy it."

France saluted with almost unanimous acclamations this separation from the men and ideas of 1815. In again adopting the flag of 1789, she seemed also to be regaining possession of herself. She seemed to be winning the liberties which the Revolution had promised but had not yet bestowed. Reverentially she was about to divorce religion from politics in order to restore it to the place which it ought never to have quitted, in the temple and the individual conscience.

## CONSEQUENCES OF THE REVOLUTION OF JULY, 1830, IN FRANCE

### (1830-1840)

**Character of the Period comprised between 1830 and 1840.**—Under the Restoration only two policies found themselves face to face. These were the policy of the Holy Alliance and that of the Liberals. Thus the victory of that period is a summary of the obscure or brilliant, the generous or criminal, struggle between these two principles. After 1830 this conflict continued but was complicated by new interests.

The revolution of July, 1830, which in certain countries assured the victory to liberal ideas, seemed to promise it to others which it incited to insurrection. Meanwhile the half-ruined alliance of 1815 made an effort to maintain itself. If the western Powers, France, England, Belgium, Switzerland, Spain, and Portugal, escaped therefrom forever, the central and eastern states, Prussia, Austria, and Russia, remained faithful to that alliance. But the principle of free society daily enlarged its scope like a sea which eats away its shores and thrusts its waves always farther inland. Thus gradually spreading it agitated Italy, shook Germany, and raised Poland for a moment from her bier.

The principal representative of the spirit of reaction in the preceding period had been Prince Metternich, with his calm skill and his cautious and temporizing policy. Now the Emperor Nicholas was its highest expression by his implacable energy and his activity as well as by the grandeur of his plans.

But new questions arise and divert attention from internal anxieties. The immense heritage of the Turkish Empire seemed about opening up, and men asked themselves uneasily who were to be its heirs. Egypt, on the shortest road to India, was becoming civilized under a barbarian genius and the maritime powers were quarreling over their influence on the Nile. Central Asia became the battlefield for the rival intrigues of England and Russia. The barriers which shut off the extreme East opened a little and were soon to fall before the commerce of the world. The activity of mankind expanded. From 1789 to 1815 men thought only of France, victorious or vanquished, and forgot Asia, where England was growing strong, and the New World, where the American Republic was noiselessly becoming a giant. Between 1815 and 1830 attention, still centered upon Europe, turned aside for a moment only to behold the birth of the new states of Spanish America. In the third period one must go from pole to pole, would he keep pace with civilization, which wishes to complete its possession of the globe by commerce or by war, its two mighty instruments.

**King Louis Philippe.**—La Fayette said to the people at the city hall, pointing toward the Duke of Orleans, "There is the best of republics." Many thought like La Fayette. The private virtues of the prince, his noble family, his former relations with the leaders of the Liberal party, the carefully revived memories of Jemmapes and Valmy, his simple habits, and the popular education given to his sons in the public schools—all encouraged the hopes of the people.

The Duke of Orleans, the head of the younger branch of the house of Bourbon, was proclaimed king on August 9, after having sworn to observe the revised charter. The changes then made in the constitutional compact,

or during the following months in the existing laws, were unimportant. The heredity of the peerage and the censorship of the press were abolished. The qualification for election was fixed at 500 francs and the qualification to serve as an elector at 200 francs. Thus the political rights of persons of fortune were maintained without specially stipulating those of intelligence. The article was suppressed which recognized the Roman Catholic religion as the state religion, and all the peerages created by Charles X were abolished. But in 1814 Louis XVIII had seemed to grant a charter of his own good will. In 1830 Louis Philippe accepted one which the deputies imposed. Therein lay the whole revolution. Nevertheless the fact must not be forgotten that rights, first violated by royalty, had been again violated by the Chamber, since the deputies had disposed of the crown and re-made the constitution without a mandate from the country. This will prove for the Orleans dynasty an incurable source of weakness. The government, born of a fact and not of a principle, will not enjoy either the force formerly conferred by legitimacy or that which is to-day conferred by the national expression.

**The Laffitte Ministry** (1830).—The shock caused by the fall of the Restoration had imparted an unexpected strength to the republican party. This party must be taken into account first of all. It was flattered for awhile in the person of two men whom the republicans respected, General La Fayette, who was appointed commander of all the national guard of France, and M. Laffitte, who was called to the ministry (November 2). The popularity of the former was cleverly exploited until after the trial of the ministers of Charles X, and that of the latter until the moment when it became necessary to make a plain declaration of sentiments on foreign policy.

France had the distinguished honor of riveting the attention of the world upon herself. At the crash of the throne which crumbled at Paris all the unpopular Powers were compromised. We shall soon see that in Switzerland the aristocratic governments fell, and that liberal innovations were introduced into Germany. Italy was

quivering with excitement. Spain was preparing a revolution. Belgium was separating from Holland. England herself, troubled and agitated, was on the point of wresting the Reform Bill from the Tories. Peace was more profitable to liberty than war and French ideas rewon the conquests which French arms had lost.

But was France to champion every European insurrection at the risk of inciting a general war and of shedding torrents of blood? The new king did not think so. Belgium had separated from Holland and wished to unite with France. Her advances were discouraged for fear of exciting the jealousy of England. The Spanish refugees wanted to make a revolution in their country. They were arrested on the frontier so that international law should not be violated even against a prince who was a secret enemy. Poland, liberated for a few moments by a heroic effort, appealed to France. Was it possible to save her by arms? As the Poles themselves said in their national calamity, "God is too high and France is too far." The meager assistance sent to her did not prevent Warsaw from succumbing to Russian vengeance. Its fall found a sad echo in the heart of every Frenchman. Italy, bound hand and foot by Austria, strove to break her chains. M. Laffitte wished to aid her. The king refused to follow his advice and called Casimir-Périer to the presidency of the Council.

**The Casimir-Périer Ministry** (1831).—This policy was esteemed too prudent. Casimir-Périer imparted to it a momentary grandeur by the energy with which he supported this system of moderation. He made two distinct declarations. The first was, that he desired order and legality, and consequently would combat the republicans and legitimists to the death if they employed riots to effect the triumph of their opinions; the second was that he would not plunge France into a universal war and consequently for the sake of peace would make every sacrifice compatible with the honor of the country. This haughty language was supported by deeds. Dom Miguel in Portugal had maltreated two Frenchmen. A fleet forced the defenses of the Tagus, which were reputed impassable, and anchored 300 fathoms from the quays of

Lisbon. The Portuguese ministers humbly made proper reparation. The Dutch invaded Belgium. Fifty thousand French entered the country and the flag of the Netherlands retreated. The Austrians who had once left the pontifical states returned thither. Casimir-Périer, determined to enforce the principle of non-intervention, sent a flotilla into the Adriatic, and troops landed and seized Ancona. This appearance of the tri-colored flag in the center of Italy was almost equivalent to a declaration of war. Austria did not accept the challenge but withdrew her troops.

At home the President of the Council followed with the same energy the line of conduct which he had marked out for himself. The legitimists were disturbing the western departments. Flying columns stifled the revolt. The workmen of Lyons, excited by their misery but also by agitators, rose, inscribing on their banners this plaintive and sinister motto: "To work and live or to fight and die." After a horrible conflict in the heart of the city they were disarmed and on the surface order seemed to be restored. Grenoble in its turn was a scene of blood. The so-called plots of Notre Dame and of the Rue des Prouvaires broke out in Paris.

Such was the ministry of Casimir-Périer, an energetic struggle in which his strong will did not recoil at any obstacle for the cause of order. Colleagues, Chambers, the king himself, he dominated over them all. Such a life had exhausted his strength when he was stricken down by cholera (May 16, 1832).

**Ministry of October 11, 1832.**—Society was profoundly undermined by the partisans of Saint Simon and Fourier, who demanded another social order. These men as yet played the part of pacific apostles only, but the insurrection in Lyons had revealed the masses as an army fully prepared to apply their doctrines. The national guard with energy defended royalty when, after the funeral of General Lamarque, the republicans fought and lost the battle of June 5 and 6 behind the barricades of Saint Méry. This check disconcerted their party for a time. A month later the death of the Duke of Reichstadt, the son of Napoleon, removed a formidable rival from the

Orleans dynasty, which at the same time seemed to gain support by the marriage of Princess Louise to the king of the Belgians.

**Success Abroad.**—Certain results of the French foreign policy reacted on their domestic policy. Thus the capture by French troops of the citadel of Antwerp, which the Dutch refused to restore to the Belgians, terminated a critical situation which might any moment have brought on war. Further acquisitions in Africa as well as an expedition to the banks of the Scheldt cast a little glory on the French army.

In the East French diplomacy mediated between the Sultan and his victorious vassal, Mehmet Ali, the pasha of Egypt. The Treaty of Kutaieh, which left Syria to Mehmet Ali, strengthened the viceroy of Egypt, the guardian in behalf of Europe of the two chief commercial routes of the Red Sea and the Persian Gulf which England wished to seize.

In Portugal Dom Miguel, an absolutist prince, was dethroned and replaced by Doña Maria, who gave her people a constitutional charter (1834). In Spain Ferdinand VII died (1834), excluding from the succession his brother, Don Carlos, who was upheld by the retrograde party. Thus the whole peninsula might escape at the same time from the absolutist party had England and France been ready to combine and prevent another Congress of Laibach or Verona. The treaty of the Quadruple Alliance, signed on April 22, 1834, between the courts of Paris, London, Lisbon, and Madrid, did, in fact, promise to the new Spanish and Portuguese governments the support of the two great constitutional countries against the ill-will of the northern courts. An army corps of 50,000 men was formed at the foot of the Pyrenees for the purpose of supporting, in case of need, the young Queen Isabella against the Spanish legitimists, the natural allies of the French legitimists.

**Insurrections at Lyons and at Paris** (1834). **Attempt of Fieschi** (1835).—At home the Chambers had at last passed a law organizing primary instruction (1833). In Parliament, on important questions, the ministry was sure of the majority. Though the jury often acquitted

persons accused of political crimes, the army was faithful, and the first attempt against the life of the king caused royalty to profit by the horror which such crimes always inspire. "Well! They have fired at me," said the king. "Sire," replied Dupin, "they have fired at themselves."

The insurrections of April, 1834, at Lyons and at Paris, and the dramatic incidents of the trial of 164 republicans before the Court of Peers, led to the imprisonment or flight of nearly all their leaders and the momentary ruin of that party as a militant faction.

Meanwhile the violent had recourse again to assassination. At the review of July 28, 1835, Fieschi, a returned convict and forger, directed an infernal machine at the king. Eighteen persons were killed and twenty wounded. Among the slain was Marshal Mortier.

This horrible attempt appalled society. The ministry took advantage of the universal indignation to present the Laws of September concerning the Court of Assizes, the jury, and the press. They were planned to render punishment for crime more severe and more prompt. They prohibited all discussion as to the principles of the government and curtailed the press.

**The Thiers Ministry** (1836).—The cause of order, earnestly upheld at home, was now triumphant. M. Thiers, President of the Ministerial Council after February 22, 1836, wished to repeat the foreign policy of Casimir-Périer. The Spanish Carlists were making threatening progress in the peninsula. M. Thiers decided to interfere. England herself requested it. This course indicated closer relations with that Power and the intention of defending liberal ideas in Europe. The memory of the unfortunate intervention of 1823 would thus have been gloriously effaced. Because the timorous king would allow no intervention in Spain, M. Thiers, rather than yield, quitted the ministry, where he was replaced by M. Molé as President of the Council.

**The Molé Ministry** (1836-1839).—The first part of M. Molé's ministry was marked by misfortunes. Prince Louis, the nephew of Napoleon, tried to rouse the garrison of Strasburg to revolt. He was arrested and con-

ducted beyond the frontiers. These checks were relieved during the following year by some successes. The army at last planted its flag upon the walls of Constantine in Africa (1837). To end a long-standing quarrel with Mexico an expedition was dispatched which took possession of Vera Cruz. Mexico paid a war indemnity. The Prince de Joinville was on the fleet. He displayed the same courage which his brothers had often shown in Africa. The birth of a son to the Duke of Orleans, to whom the king gave the name of Count of Paris, seemed to consolidate the dynasty.

But vigorous attacks upon the ministry were already preparing in the heart of Parliament. M. Molé had just recalled the French troops from Ancona in compliance with the terms of the treaty of 1833. It was asserted that the removal of the tri-colored flag from Ancona was a humiliation to France in Europe and the abandonment of a precious guarantee against Austria. French diplomacy was no more happy in the final regulation of the Dutch-Belgian affair. The Belgians by their revolution had aimed at separating two peoples of different language, religion, and interests. But the treaty of the twenty-four articles, accepted by the French ministry, ceded to the king of Holland Belgian populations which had fought against him. Europe would not allow the friendly province of Luxemburg to be annexed to France, which would have covered a vulnerable point in the French frontier.

With a little more regard for the national honor and with a little more confidence in the national strength, it was said that those concessions for peace at any price might have been spared. But the real pretext of these attacks was what was called the insufficiency of the ministry. M. Guizot, the leader of the doctrinaires, who were a small but talented and ambitious party; M. Thiers, the leader of the Left Center, which vigorously condemned personal government; and M. Odilon Barrot, leader of the deputies opposed to the policy, but devoted to the person of the king, formed a coalition with the motto of 1830: "The king reigns, but does not govern." The ministry wished to resign. The king, whose cause

was at stake, refused to allow it, and appealed to the country by dissolving the Chamber. The ministry fought vigorously in the electoral battle, but was vanquished and fell. Jealousies in the distribution of offices caused the coalition to disband the day after its victory. Difficulties over the formation of a new ministry kept Paris in suspense for more than a month. Certain republicans, with more faith in gunshots than in the propaganda of ideas, attempted a revolution. They could not even get up a riot.

**Ministry of Marshal Soult** (1839).—At last a cabinet was formed under the presidency of Marshal Soult. None of the leaders of the coalition were members of it. Therefore it could be nothing but a ministry ad interim. It did not last ten months.

Meanwhile, the Emir Abd-el Kader in Africa proclaimed the Holy War. Within two months the regular infantry of the Moslem chieftain was crushed at the battle of Chiffa. Still the great concern of this cabinet was not Algiers, but the redoubtable Eastern question, as we shall see later on.

## CONSEQUENCES TO EUROPE OF THE REVOLUTION OF JULY

### (1830-1840)

**General State of Europe in 1830.**—The revolution of July was not the cause of the memorable events which occurred in Europe after the three days of Paris. Everything was ripe in England for the fall of the Tories; in Belgium, Italy, and Poland for a national insurrection; in Spain and Portugal and in the bosom of the Germanic Confederation for enforcing the complaints of the constitutionalists. The repressive policy, followed by the great states after 1815, had prepared the inflammable materials upon which fell a spark from the conflict at Paris. Then the fire burst out in every direction. At certain points it did its work and cleared the ground for new edifices. At others it was stopped, smothered

for the moment. Some of the nations abandoned the system of authority for the contract system. That is, they repudiated the theory of aristocratic or royal rights and adopted that of the rights of the nation. Other peoples, held to the earth by powerful hands, moved restlessly, but were unable to gain their feet.

**England. Whig Ministry** (1830). **The Reform Bill** (1831-1832).—The first Parliament which assembled at London after the French Revolution of 1830 overthrew the Tory ministry, despite its illustrious leader, the Duke of Wellington. The Whigs assumed the direction of affairs and introduced a Reform Bill which suppressed fifty-six rotten boroughs, gave representation to the towns which had none, and created a multitude of new electors by lowering the electoral requirement in the towns to a household franchise of ten pounds sterling. Thus the English reform was much more liberal than the French. Thus the number of electors was almost doubled. England alone then had more than 800,000. But we shall see in 1848 the fate of the Orleans monarchy staked on the question of adding 24,000 electors to a body of voters only a fourth as numerous as the voters in aristocratic England. Yet the population of the latter country was only half that of France. For fourteen months the Lords resisted the Commons, the ministers, the king himself, as well as popular demonstrations which brought together as many as 300,000 persons. They only yielded before the threat of the creation of enough Liberal peers to change the majority. The Whigs also made Parliament pass two other liberal measures. The one in 1833 emancipated 600,000 negroes. This cost England 16,500,000 pounds sterling. The other in the following year was the new Poor Law which, while relieving distress, diminished the expenditure. In order to induce the Lords to accept the Reform Bill, Wellington, the Tory leader, had acknowledged sadly that the time was when the upper Chamber could make its sentiments prevail: that England must resign herself to wishing what the Commons wished. The English aristocracy, the strongest and richest in the world,

and also the one which, during the past century and a half, had displayed the most political sagacity, announced in plaintive words its abdication as a governing class. The useful function was left it, which it has well fulfilled even to the present hour, of acting as a moderator or restrainer. Such a curb is as necessary in those great organisms called states as in powerful and dangerous machines of industry.

Thus, in the credit column of the revolution of July must be set down its influence upon the English people. This influence was bloodless and useful to both countries. In helping to hurl the Tories from power and elevating the Liberals to their place, France secured friends on the other side of the Channel. King Louis Philippe was able to offset the cold and haughty attitude of the courts of Germany and Russia by the "cordial understanding" with England. Hence the two western Powers, united for many years by a community of ideas and interests, were able to check reactionary ambitions and favor the legitimate aspirations of the peoples.

The first fruit of this alliance was the pacific solution of the Belgian question.

**Belgian Revolution** (August and September, 1830).— In 1815 the English had had Belgium given to Holland as indemnity for the Dutch colonies which they wished to keep. Moreover, they had descried in this combination a means of repressing and keeping watch upon France from the northeast. But Belgium, which had the French language, French laws, and the French religion, felt the same repugnance as in the sixteenth century to joining the Batavian provinces. The king of the Netherlands increased this antipathy by quarrels with the Roman Catholic clergy and with the court of Rome. He prohibited French in the schools and law-courts and forbade the students of his kingdom to attend foreign universities. Writers were thrown into prison; journalists were condemned. Such was the irritation of the Belgians in 1829 that innumerable petitions addressed to the two Chambers protested against the abuses of authority perpetrated by the government. Thus, one month after the

Paris revolution Brussels took fire. All the towns of Brabant and Flanders followed its example, and the Dutch army was driven back upon the citadel of Antwerp, the only point in the Belgian territory which remained to it.

England had viewed with displeasure this overthrow of the work of 1815. She lived in dread that France would occupy Antwerp and thus hold the mouths of the Scheldt and Meuse. The Speech from the Throne, drawn up by the Tory ministry, censured the Revolution of Brabant. The broader spirit of the Whigs, aided by the moderation of Louis Philippe, prevented complications. In the conference which assembled at London on November 4, 1830, the northern Powers themselves acknowledged the impossibility of maintaining the union under the same scepter of two so different populations. It was decided to permit the organization of a Belgian kingdom on the sole condition that the king should not be selected from any one of the five royal houses whose representatives sat in the conference. Thus, when the Congress of Brussels elected the Duke de Nemours, the second son of Louis Philippe, that prince refused for his house an honor which would have imperiled France (February, 1831). A few months later another election called to the throne of Belgium the Prince of Saxe-Coburg, whose sagacity assured the new state an unflagging prosperity through forty years. The conference finished its work by deciding that 50,000 French troops should enter Belgium to repel the aggression of the Dutch. The capture of Antwerp, after operations memorable for the skill of both the besiegers and the besieged, settled the question from a military point of view. Diplomacy spent more than six years in reaching the point of persuading the two parties to sign the definite treaty in April, 1839. The perpetual neutrality of Belgium was recognized by all the Powers.

**Liberal Modifications in the Constitutions of Switzerland (1831), of Denmark (1831), and of Sweden (1840.**—In northern countries, whether it be those regions which incline toward the pole or those which, under a less elevated latitude, lie at the foot of Alpine glaciers, pas-

sion is less vigorous and action is more restrained. Switzerland in 1815 was compelled to conform to the Holy Alliance. The wealthier classes of Europe and America did not then as now every summer flock to the mountains and spend their money. The principal source of revenue was the wages of Swiss regiments at Rome, Naples, Madrid, in France, and even in the Netherlands. Until 1830 Switzerland was necessarily deferential to the Powers of the day. She tolerated the Jesuits in the Valais and at Freiburg. At the demand of foreign ministers she dealt severely with the press and restricted the right of asylum which refugees from every land invoked on her soil. On the news that France was freeing herself from the reactionary policy, nearly all the cantons, by legal means and the pressure of public opinion, demanded more liberal institutions. Austria massed troops in the Vorarlberg and the Tyrol to intimidate the Liberals, but the Diet decreed a levy of 60,000 men and 100,000 took up arms. The sovereigns, menaced by the Belgian revolution and the ever-increasing agitation of Italy and Germany, made haste to send assurances of peace. Abandoned to themselves the aristocratic governments of Switzerland crumbled to pieces. The nobles lost their former immunities, and that wise people effected its political evolution without shedding a drop of blood. Only later on were there violent disturbances at Neuchâtel, whose inhabitants rebelled against the king of Prussia, their sovereign, and at Basle, where the burghers insisted upon retaining privileges to the detriment of the rural communes.

Denmark did not experience even these slight disorders. The king, of his own initiative, instituted four provincial assemblies for the Islands, Jutland, Schleswig, and Holstein (1831). Later on he gave a General Diet to the whole kingdom (1849). Sweden was still more patient. Permeated after 1830 by liberal ideas, she waited until 1840. Then she reconstructed her government by instituting two elective chambers, made the ministers responsible, and abolished the hereditary rights of the nobility, although maintaining the distinction of orders.

**Revolutions in Spain** (1833) **and in Portugal** (1834). **Treaty of the Quadruple Alliance** (1834).—The South, where passions are more ardent, was disturbed by armed insurrections and revolutions. At Madrid Ferdinand VII still satisfied the heart of the absolutists. At first he refused to recognize the new king of France and encouraged by sympathy at least the mad enterprise of the Duchess of Berri. But he exhumed a secret declaration of Charles IV in 1789 which revoked the pragmatic sanction of Philip V. That sanction allowed a daughter to ascend the throne only in default of sons. This declaration was a return to the ancient law of succession, which had formed the greatness of Spain by the union of Aragon and Castile under Isabella the Catholic, and which had bestowed the crown on Charles V. Moreover, the king felt no scruples at dispossessing his brother, Don Carlos, who had twice tried to dethrone him. Maria Christina gave birth to a daughter, Isabella, who, on the death of Ferdinand, became queen in September, 1833, under the guardianship of her mother. The "apostolicals," trampling on national traditions and faithless to their principle of the divine right of kings which had permitted Charles II in 1700 to bequeath his peoples as his own property even to a stranger, took the part of Don Carlos. He prepared to claim the throne sword in hand. In consequence the regent, to save the crown for her daughter, was obliged to seek the support of the constitutionals. Thus a family quarrel was destined to restore the Spanish government to the Liberal party; but a civil war of seven years' duration was unchained upon the peninsula.

Don Carlos first took refuge with Dom Miguel, who, aided by Marshal Bourmont, by French legitimists, and the absolutists of Portugal, was defending his usurpation against his brother, Dom Pedro. The latter was upheld by the effectual sympathy of France and England. On July 8, 1832, the constitutionals seized Oporto. In the following year the victories of Saint Vincent and Lisbon put them in possession of the capital. At last the treaty of the Quadruple Alliance was concluded in April, 1834, with England and France, by Dom Pedro

and Maria Christina in the name of their daughters, the young Queens Doña Maria and Isabella II. This constrained Dom Miguel to leave the kingdom.

Thus defeated in Portugal, the absolutists understood that they must hold their ground in Spain or their cause would be lost in Western Europe and compromised everywhere. Don Carlos raised the northern provinces to insurrection, and especially the whole Basque country, which was still devoted to its ancient fueros and hostile to centralization at Madrid. The Carlist bands infested all the Pyrenees. Under Gomez and Cabrera they penetrated to the environs of Madrid. Zumalacarreguy even succeeded for a time in substituting the guerrilla conflicts, which settle nothing, by war on a great scale, which might end everything. He was mortally wounded in 1835 before Bilbao.

The Carlists had summoned to their aid all those whom the revolution of July had vanquished or menaced. The partisans of Henry V upheld the Spanish pretender. But it was impossible for the northern courts to send him regular forces. The fleets of England and France barred the sea and the Pyrenees were remote from Vienna, Berlin, and Moscow.

The struggle was conducted with the horrors usual in Spanish wars, although in the ranks of both parties were many volunteers. This lasted until 1840 amid sanguinary vicissitudes and political intrigues which overthrew many ministries at Madrid. Espartero, whom the regent pompously created Duke de la Victoria, put an end to the Carlist war and then expelled Maria Christina (October, 1840) and usurped her place as regent. Three years later he was expelled in turn by Narvaez (July, 1843). Under the hand of this rough soldier the Spanish monarchy became almost constitutional though strongly conservative.

**Impotent Efforts of the Liberals in Germany and Italy (1831). Defeat of the Polish Insurrection** (1831).—Thus, Northern Europe and all the West entered into the movement which began on the fall of Charles X. Other countries would gladly have followed this example, but

they found themselves restrained by bonds too strong to be broken.

The consequences of the revolution of July did not make themselves felt, at least ostensibly, in the two great German monarchies. Absolute power in Austria and Prussia was protected by a powerful military establishment, by the alliance of the government at both Berlin and Vienna with the state church, by the support of a numerous nobility which took for its motto "God and the king," and by the political reserve of a burgher class on whom manufactures and commerce had not as yet bestowed fortune, and with it the sense of strength and a legitimate pride. Frederick William III contented himself by relaxing the control of the press and by rendering censorship more mild. These concessions were not dangerous. Moreover, he counterbalanced them by the advantages which resulted for Prussia from the completion of the Zollverein. Thus he turned men's minds aside from burning questions of government and paved the way for the political hegemony of Prussia by her commercial hegemony (May 11, 1833).

Things went on otherwise in the petty states. Brunswick, the two Hesses, Saxony, Hanover, Oldenburg, and Bavaria were agitated by movements which dethroned many princes and obliged others to concede charters and reforms. But, when Russia had "caused order to reign in Warsaw," among the Poles, and when the French government had triumphed over the revolutionary spirit by its victory over both the legitimists and the republicans, the diplomats of Austria and Prussia returned to the stage and again put in action the Diet of Frankfort, a convenient instrument on which they played to perfection. The Diet was still presided over by Austria and was under her influence. In June, 1832, it decreed that the princes required the coöperation of the representative assemblies only for the exercise of certain rights, and that these assemblies could not refuse the means necessary for the execution of the measures which interested the Confederation as a whole. A commission was appointed to watch over the deliberations of the Chambers, as commissions had already been appointed to

keep an eye upon the press and education. Of these three suspects Prince Metternich never lost sight. Another regulation ordered the princes to lend each other mutual aid and to surrender to each other political prisoners. A few months later (August, 1833) the two great Powers, who distrusted the activity of the Diet and the energy of its commissioners, had themselves authorized to constitute a commission whose task was to put a stop to revolutionary attempts. In this commission they admitted the representatives of Bavaria, so as to disguise the sort of abdication which the Diet had just made into their hands. Arrests and proscriptions began again all over Germany. The Tsar, who had come to Münchengrätz in Bohemia for the purpose of personally strengthening the sovereigns of Prussia and Austria in their ideas of resistance, obtained from them the expulsion of the Polish refugees, who were to be transported to America.

One can realize how much liberty remained to the thirty-nine states whose independence had been recognized by the Congress of Vienna. From her hatred of liberal institutions Austria was constantly inciting the Diet to encroach upon the sovereignty of the princes. Thus, little by little, the Confederation became a motley body which lacked only a head. Austria was firmly convinced that she was destined to become that head. But on the day when the stage curtain of Frankfort was torn away, it was Prussia which was to appear, victorious and menacing with her motto, "Might makes right." Prince Metternich was to learn, too late, that he had toiled for half a century only to aid Austria's rival and to enable her without scruple to dethrone kings and humiliate kings and effect the unity of Germany against Austria quite as much as against France.

In Italy the king of Naples, Ferdinand II, reassured by the paid fidelity of his Swiss regiments, waited for an insurrection which everyone foresaw. Louis Philippe, his brother-in-law, sent him a memorandum of General Pepe, indicating the reforms which must be made in order to avert a catastrophe. He read it, returned thanks, and replied, like Cæsar, "They will not dare."

He was right so far as Naples was concerned, at least during his lifetime. But on February 4, 1831, Bologna rose, then Umbria and the Romagna, and at the end of a month the Pope retained hardly more than the Roman Campagna. The brothers, Charles and Louis Napoleon, offered their aid to the leaders of the insurrection, in which the former lost his life. Parma and Modena also expelled their princes. The Austrians seized upon this pretext to cross the Po, reëstablish the fugitives, and crush the movement in the Romagna.

The Italian patriots had counted upon France. The French government announced to the Powers that its foreign policy would be regulated by the principle of non-intervention; but it had no idea of going to war for the purpose of forcing this principle into European law. So the Austrians were left free to overwhelm the inhabitants of the Romagna and to violate the conventions which they had signed. Only when they seemed to be establishing themselves permanently in Ferrara and Bologna Louis Philippe occupied Ancona for seven years. This action possessed a certain grandeur and exercised due influence. Following the example of the king of Naples, the Pope hired a small army of mercenaries. The States of the Church presented the singular spectacle of the sovereign pontiff living under the protection of foreign bayonets; for the Swiss were at Rome, the French at Ancona, and the Austrians at Bologna. In the midst of these trans-Alpine troops the cardinals and legates administered affairs and judged and condemned to exile, to prison, and the galleys just as under the paternal absolutist governments. But the five great Powers recognized the fact that the spirit of revolt was being nursed in a manner dangerous to the repose of Europe by such a detestable administration. At the invitation of France they drew up the memorandum of May, 1831, in which they begged the Holy Father to grant certain civil rights to laymen and to introduce certain reforms. Cardinal Bernetti promised "a new era," but, the danger once past, everything went on as before. From one end of the peninsula to the other, except in Tuscany and Piedmont, the rigors of 1816

and of 1821 appeared again. Military commissions were formed, severe measures were taken against the universities, foreign books were prohibited, men were condemned to the galleys for a word, for a thought. After a riot at Syracuse, Ferdinand II ordered fifty-two persons to be shot. Never were rulers and ministers blinder to the dangers with which an unseasonable policy is attended. They did not perceive that by repressing the legitimate aspirations of the constitutionals they were forming republicans. Mazzini was replacing Pepe and Santa Rosa.

In Eastern Europe a most formidable insurrection began. Poland rose as one man, set up a regular government, organized a powerful army, made war on a great scale, and for a time held in check all the forces of the Russian Empire. Here again, as in Italy, men desired political freedom, but national independence above all. The movement broke out on November 29, 1830. Through excess of prudence, after an excess of rashness, no attempt was made to propagate the insurrection in the Polish provinces outside the eight palatinates that formed the kingdom as constituted by the Congress of Vienna. The partitioners of 1773 were of one mind in upholding their work. While 100,000 Russians marched on Warsaw, 60,000 Prussians in the Duchy of Posen and as many Austrians in Galicia guarded against the revolutionary contagion the share of Polish spoils which had fallen to them. Moreover, the two governments of Vienna and Berlin agreed to intercept all communication of the insurgents with Europe and to unite their forces with those of Russia if the revolt invaded their provinces. Prussia did even more. After the sanguinary battles of Wawre and Grochow in February, 1831, and of Dembe and Ostrolenka in March and May, Marshal Paskevitch changed his plan of forcing Warsaw from the front and resolved to attack the city by the right bank of the Vistula. This bold and dangerous march would separate him from his base. Frederick William III opened to him Königsberg and Dantzic, so that he might be able to revictual his army. This was direct coöperation in the war and a violation of

the principle of non-intervention professed by the western Powers. Nevertheless they raised no serious objection, although the Polish cause was very popular in France and England. In those two countries committees were formed which sent to Poland money, volunteers, and arms. But at Paris, as at London, the governments were fully resolved not to meddle in a quarrel which lay outside the sphere of their military action.

King Louis Philippe negotiated, so as to have the air of doing something. The British Cabinet, which also held hostile nations, like Ireland and India, in harsh dependency, declared that the rights of the Tsar were indisputable. Abandoned to their own resources, the Poles were doomed to succumb. Warsaw fell on September 8, 1831, after a heroic resistance. Nicholas, erasing from the treaties of 1815 the articles which conceded to Poland an independent existence with national institutions, converted her territory into Russian provinces. The patriots were exiled and suspected persons were stripped of their possessions. Russian became the official language. Roman Catholicism was the religion of the land. It was deprived of a number of churches, which were bestowed upon the Orthodox Greek faith. While all Roman Catholic propaganda was prohibited, religious apostasy as well as political desertion was encouraged. Nicholas would have liked to suppress even the history of Poland. At all events he blotted out her name. In official documents Poland was thereafter called the " governments " of the Vistula.

## THE THREE EASTERN QUESTIONS

### (1832-1848)

**Interests of the European Powers in Asia.**—The Eastern Question is threefold rather than single or double. The first form is discussed on the shores of the Bosphorus, and the second in the center of Asia. In both the antagonists are Russia and England. It is of prime necessity to the latter to control every route which leads

to her Indian Empire. Therefore she desires the maintenance, as "buffers," of those states in Western Asia which Russia menaces by her arms or her diplomacy. The third form of the Eastern Question concerns the eastern portions of the Asiatic continent, including China and Japan. It interests Russia and Great Britain primarily, but in scarcely less degree the United States and all maritime nations. Among these, during the past decade, have been included Germany and France. Such questions require many years to settle. Although puzzled over so long by the world, they are still only in their preliminary stages.

This portion of modern history does not present the spectacle, which we have just considered in the West, of two societies in the name of different ideas striving with each other for universal acceptance. In place of a war of two abstract principles, we shall behold a hand-to-hand conflict of mercantile interests and territorial expansion. The two Powers which play the principal part in these events seek mainly the acquisition of provinces or guineas. Moral considerations are constantly lost from sight. Thus British cannon force the Chinese government to allow the introduction of opium from British India, so that the deficit of the East India Company may be made good. But man often accomplishes a better work than he designs. After the violent deeds of Lord Clive and Warren Hastings and the aggressive wars and cruel sentences of the Tsars, India is being covered with a network of railroads, and the Siberian waste dotted with commercial cities. Security and social life are transforming the steppes of the nomads which they never visited before.

**The First Eastern Question. Constantinople.**—The Tsar, the first Nicholas, cherished vast designs. His states already covered half of Europe and a third of Asia. But Russia had no outlet of the south, and her ports on the Baltic were frozen up a large portion of the year. Only by the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles could she reach the Mediterranean, and they were closed against her. "Constantinople is the key of the Russian house." It dominates Greece, Western Asia, and the passages to the

Indies by the Red Sea and the Persian Gulf. Between the Russians and most of the Christian subjects of the Sultan there was strong religious affinity, as both were members of the Orthodox or Greek Church. In 1829 the troops of Nicholas had captured Adrianople and advanced within a few leagues of the Golden Horn. His eyes were still fixed upon the "second capital of the Roman Empire." Once established in that impregnable position, he could have undertaken the project of Napoleon against the British domination in India.

But, though Austria was in political alliance with the Russians, their ambitious hopes caused her great anxiety. Herself a half-Slav state, she dreaded to have them penetrate the valley of the Danube and wave the flag of pan-Slavism before her populations of the same blood. Moreover, herself a maritime power, their establishment in the seaports of the Levant would ruin her commerce. But the Tsar could not reach Constantinople by land without a sort of permit of transit from the Austrians, and the English would bar his path by sea. By securing Galicia and Bukovina as her share of Poland, Austria had occupied the upper valleys of the Pruth and Dniester. Hence the road which the Russian army must follow to the Marmora was a line 400 miles in length, perpendicular to the military roads of Austria, and might be cut at a thousand points, whenever the Sultan should summon that power to his aid and throw open to its armies the valley of the Danube. Certain of finding the Austro-Hungarian forces on this road and the English in the Dardanelles, Nicholas waited for fresh complications and contented himself with imposing on the Sultan his haughty protection.

**Decline of Turkey. Ambition of the Viceroy of Egypt.** —Turkey was rapidly descending that declivity which is so difficult for a nation to reascend. In 1774 she had lost the Crimea and the mouth of the Dnieper; in 1772, the left bank of the Dniester; in 1812, Bessarabia as far as the Pruth; in 1829, the mouths of the Danube and a part of Armenia. Thus the bulwarks of the empire had been falling away one after the other. Greece had won her freedom. Montenegro had never been subdued.

The Servians, Moldavians, and Wallachians under the protection of Russia had formed national governments and owed only a small tribute to the Porte.

While everything was on the decline in the north of the empire, a new power was forming in its southern provinces. Mehmet Ali, a Rumelian adventurer, had taken advantage of the disorganization of Egypt, after the departure of the French, to carve a place for himself and in 1806 to grasp the power. He had crowned this usurpation by throwing into the sea an English corps which had seized Alexandria (1807). Then he had fortified his authority after the Oriental fashion by massacring the Mamelukes whom he had lured into an ambush. The fierce Wahabites, the Protestants of Islam, had captured Mecca, Medina, and Damascus. He exterminated them in a war which lasted six years. Thus to Mussulman orthodoxy he restored its holy cities and its sanctuary, and enabled it in safety to make the annual pilgrimage. His conquest of Sennaar, Kordofan, and Dongola, in the valley of the upper Nile, restored some pride to that empire which was wasting away everywhere else. The viceroy of Egypt was thus encircled with a double halo as religious restorer and invincible conqueror. In Europe, and especially in France, he was considered a reformer. With the aid of French engineers and officers he created a merchant marine and a war-fleet, organized an army, which was drilled in European style, constructed various arsenals and workshops, and founded schools. To render these enterprises possible, he had effected such a revolution as was possible only with the fellahs, one of the meekest peoples on earth. They had been trained by sixteen centuries of servitude to endure everything without a murmur. Not only had he as sovereign declared himself sole proprietor of the soil, which in Mussulman countries is in full accordance with the written law, but he had gone still farther and appropriated to himself the monopoly of agriculture and trade. Hence, as sole proprietor, sole producer, and sole merchant in all Egypt, he never lacked money for an undertaking or soldiers for his regiments.

**Conquest of Syria by Ibrahim Pasha** (1832). **Treaty of Hunkiar Iskelessi** (1833).—In all ages the masters of Egypt have been desirous to possess Syria and the great islands of the eastern Mediterranean. Thus they might obtain building timber, in which Egypt is absolutely lacking, and harbors to supplement Alexandria, which until the creation of Port Saïd by M. De Lesseps was the only port in the Delta. To reward his services in Greece, Crete was added to the provinces of Mehmet Ali. This did not satisfy his ambition, which could only content itself by regenerating or dismembering the empire. For his share he aimed at Syria, whose mountain fastnesses covered the approach to Egypt and overhung the route to India by way of the Euphrates and the Persian Gulf. Under the pretext of pursuing some fellah fugitives and ending a personal quarrel with the pasha of Saint Jean d'Acre, his son, Ibrahim Pasha, in 1831 attacked that stronghold which had resisted General Bonaparte. He captured it and subdued the whole of Syria. The first army sent by the Sultan against him was destroyed in many encounters. A second Ottoman army lost the great battle of Konieh, north of the Taurus, in December, 1832. The road to Constantinople was open, and Ibrahim was hurrying thither. Mahmoud in terror implored the assistance of Russia. The fleet from Sebastopol immediately entered the Bosphorus, where 15,000 Russians landed while 45,000 crossed the Danube "to save the Sultan." France and England were in consternation at the arrival of the Russians, and persuaded Mahmoud and his vassal to accept the Convention of Kutaïah in May, 1833, which gave over Syria to Mehmet Ali. The Russians withdrew, but by the Treaty of Hunkiar Iskelessi, signed in June, 1833, an offensive and defensive alliance was concluded between the Tsar and the Sultan. A single clause, aimed at France and England, stipulated that the Dardanelles should be shut to all foreign warships.

The Treaty of Adrianople had closed one act in the momentous drama of the Eastern Question. That of Hunkiar Iskelessi closed another. After having begun the dismemberment of Turkey, the Tsar placed that em-

pire under his protection. Had Europe interposed no obstacle to that protection, it would soon have reduced the Ottoman Empire to a Russian dependency.

**The Treaty of London (1840) and the Treaty of the Straits (1841).**—Six years passed, during which Sultan Mahmoud made every preparation to overthrow the pasha by whom he had been humbled. In 1839 he thought that his troops were sufficiently disciplined to cope with the Egyptians, and he confided to them the task of regaining the provinces which the Convention of Kutaïah had wrested from him. Ibrahim Pasha, at the battle of Nezib, again destroyed the Ottoman army. By that victory, for a second time the road to Constantinople lay open. But if he marched upon it, he was sure to find it defended by the Russians. The intervention of Europe brought the victorious Egyptian to a halt.

Sultan Mahmoud died six days before the news of the fatal battle of Nezib reached Constantinople. He was succeeded by his son, Sultan Abd-ul Medjid, who desired peace with his resistless vassal. The Kapoudan Pasha, Achmet, through hatred for the grand vizier, surrendered the entire Ottoman fleet to the viceroy of Egypt in the harbor of Alexandria. The Ottoman Empire, then without ships and soldiers, could be saved from annihilation only by the interference of the great Powers.

England was haunted by the dread of a Russian army in Constantinople. Nor was she willing that Egypt, which lay upon one route to India and in which French influence was then paramount, should become too strong. Austria and Prussia followed in her wake. Russia, who was not then ready to act alone, preferred to have the feeble Ottomans at Constantinople rather than the energetic and successful viceroy. France only was warmly on his side.

On July 15, 1840, Great Britain, Russia, Prussia, and Austria signed the Treaty of London. It specified that Mehmet Ali should enjoy the hereditary possession of Egypt and should retain Saint Jean d'Acre during his life, but that within the space of ten days he should evacuate all his other provinces and restore them to Turkey. The four Powers charged themselves with the

execution of these terms and also agreed to depose Mehmet Ali in case of his resistance.

The viceroy refused to submit. Thereupon an English squadron bombarded Beyrut, burned the Egyptian fleet, and almost destroyed Saint Jean d'Acre, the base of Egyptian supplies. The contest was too unequal. Mehmet Ali yielded, being guaranteed the possession of Egypt.

France had not even been invited to the congress which drew up the Treaty of London. The tortuous and ignoble policy of Louis Philippe which, while sacrificing much to retain alliance with England, was making overtures to the absolutist Powers, had gained France only isolation and humiliation. The tidings that she had been utterly ignored, while the other states decided the question of the hour, caused intense indignation throughout the country. The timorous government seemed at first to sympathize with the explosion of national sentiment. It commenced fortifying the strongholds, increasing the army, and throwing up extensive works around the city of Paris. It seemed threatening to draw the sword, which, however, it did not draw.

The king became alarmed. He abandoned the ministry, which he had followed at first. M. Thiers yielded his place to M. Guizot, and the new head of the cabinet made haste to offer his hand to the Powers from whom his country had just received an insult. On July 13, 1841, he signed the Convention of the Straits. This was a double success for Lord Palmerston. He could point at the humble return of France to "the European concert" and at Russia under compulsion renouncing the secret clause of the treaty of Hunkiar Iskelessi, for the new treaty closed both the straits to ships of war. So this third act in the drama, acted around Constantinople, terminated to the advantage of England.

**The Second Eastern Question. Central Asia.**—The English had taken possession of India, and the Russians of Siberia. Between them there intervened the whole breadth of China, Turkestan, Persia, and Afghanistan. The two nations might well imagine that their frontiers would never touch. But during half a century they were

drawing ever nearer. To-day they stand almost face to face. To-morrow they may be engaged in a hand-to-hand death struggle.

**Progress of the Russians in Asia.**—The king of Georgia, a country on the southern slope of the Caucasus, in 1796 implored and obtained the assistance of Catherine II against the Persians. For the purpose of affording him better protection the Russians took possession of Derbent on the Caspian, of Daghestan, and of nearly the whole country as far as the Koura. Gradually the entire kingdom became a Russian province. Later on they seized from the Ottomans the mouth of the Faz (1809), and from the Persians Shirvan (1813), and Armenia south of the Koura as far as its tributary, the Aras (1828). They had reached Mount Ararat. The central barrier of the Caucasus was not yet crossed, but it was flanked, and some day was sure to fall. This occupation of the trans-Caucasian isthmus, moreover, gave to the Russians an excellent base of operations, either to attack Turkey from the rear and threaten Persia, or to control the Caspian and the Euxine. The Koura emptied into the one sea, and the Faz into the other. The lawless Circassian mountaineers were still unsubdued. A line of fortified posts was drawn year by year more closely around them, and by degrees forced them back into the wild gorges and upon the desolate mountain tops. Nevertheless Schamyl, their hero and prophet, maintained the "holy war" for twenty-five years and wore out successive Russian armies. In 1859 he was surrounded and captured. With him fell the independence of those restless tribes. South of the Caucasus the Tsar then possessed eight provinces, buttressed by the mountains which were occupied by his troops and covered on their flanks by strong fortresses and two great seas. United in one great military government, of which Tiflis is the center, these provinces form an impregnable advanced post for the Russian Empire. Thence her armies can take, on the right, the road to Scutari, whose heights command Stamboul, or, on the left, the road to Teheran, the capital of Persia. The merchant marine of Odessa and Taganrog, protected by the fleet of Sebastopol, the

new military post, commanded the Black Sea. The Caspian became a Russian lake, for an article of the Treaty of Tourmantchai stipulated that the Russians should have full liberty to navigate its waters and that no other nation should maintain armed vessels thereon. Thus steamer-landings, even in Persian waters, might be converted into small forts and mark out the track of future expeditions, either toward the south shore, not far distant from which rises the capital of Persia, or toward the eastern shore in the direction of Khiva and Turkestan. At the same time, Russia was advancing toward the latter countries over the immense steppes of the Kirghiz Kazaks. Stationing a war flotilla on the Sea of Aral and staking out the desert with fortresses, they would be able before long to reach the fertile regions of ancient Bactriana.

**Progress of the English in Asia.**—While Europe was occupied against republican and imperial France with wars, which England subsidized, England was completing the subjection to herself of the more than 200,000,000 inhabitants of India. In 1816 Nepaul, in the north of Hindustan, and two years later, the valiant Mahratta tribes in the Deccan, were forced to submit to British control. Each prince received at his court a resident or officer of the Company who exercised supervision. At each capital, to hold the native sovereign in submission, an English garrison was stationed, the pay of which was guaranteed from the revenues of one district in the state. Thus, without any cost to themselves, the English provided themselves with a numerous army, which ruled the Deccan and the valley of the Ganges. In 1824-1826 they made their way into India beyond the Ganges, wrested 200 leagues of seacoast from the people of Burmah, rendered the kingdom of Assam tributary, and seized Singapore and Malacca. Thus the Bay of Bengal was converted into an English sea and the great commercial highway to Indo-China was commanded. In that quarter they were thinking only of their commercial interests. On the northwest they had to take measures for their security.

**Britain vs. Russia in Central Asia.**—After the Treaty of Tourmantchai (1828), the Russian influence was predominant at Teheran. When the populace of that city, angry at the harsh conditions of peace, massacred the Russian ambassador, his family, and all the members of his household, the king of kings hastily sent his grandson to St. Petersburg to make the amplest reparation. The Tsar was merciful. But Feth Ali, the founder of the Khadjar dynasty, who since 1797 had bravely resisted his formidable neighbor, was forced to realize that the glorious days of Nadir Shah, when Ottomans, Mongols, and Russians retreated before the Persian armies, were passed and would probably never return.

The two great cities of Herat and Kabul command the communications between Persia and India. The check of Bonaparte at Saint Jean d'Acre prevented his undertaking a march to the East. After Tilsit, Napoleon proposed to the Tsar Alexander that they should unite in that grand enterprise. For years one of his secret agents traversed Mesopotamia and Persia to prepare the way. Nicholas inherited the plan and at first assigned the chief part in its execution to the Shah, who had become his vassal. Herat was in the hands of an Afghan prince. He urged the Shah to attack him. A first attempt in 1833 failed. A second in 1837 succeeded no better. A third was made the following year. The operations of the siege were conducted by Russian officers. Great Britain watched these movements with a jealous eye. Russian spies were supposed to be traveling over India. Greek and Armenian merchants, settled in Calcutta or Bombay, were suspected of furnishing the court of St. Petersburg with information concerning the army, the finances, and all the affairs of the East India Company. The natives themselves were affected by rumors, shrewdly put in circulation, concerning the decline of the power of England and the grandeur of the Muscovite Empire. "You cannot imagine," wrote a governor-general a few years later to the queen's ministers, "what an idea the peoples of India have of the strength of Russia." The Tsar Nicholas hardly made a secret of his purpose some future day to haul down the English

flag in India. One of his official organs declared before the Crimean War that, "If an attempt were made to place obstacles in his way in Europe, he would go to Calcutta and there dictate the terms of peace." Herat was one of the stages of the Russian army on its way to the valley of the Ganges, and consequently it was an advanced post of the East India Company. The two rivals met under its walls. Before the Persian troops had arrived in sight of the city, the English were inside to direct the defense. Also a squadron had sailed up the Persian Gulf and was making a demonstration against the southern provinces of Persia. The Shah was obliged to call back his forces (1838). This was a check to the Tsar. The following year he tried to indemnify himself by an expedition against Khiva, which his own generals conducted. This city lies on the second highway to India which passes by the Amu Daria and Bokhara. Frightful deserts separate Khiva from the Caspian, and the Russian army corps perished almost to a man.

Before the failure of this expedition, the English had decided to forestall the Russians, or at least to occupy on the other side of the Indus the lofty chain of the Afghan Mountains. By so doing an impregnable bulwark would defend their Indian empire on the west. Early in 1839 the army of Bengal crossed the river, marched through the Bolan Pass, and took possession of Candahar, the fortress of Ghazni, and Kabul. It placed on the throne Shah Soujah, who had been deposed and banished thirty years before. The valiant native tribes, though disconcerted for a time, speedily recovered their courage. When the governor-general tried to curtail the subsidies, at first furnished the chiefs, a general insurrection broke out. Fifteen thousand English soldiers, hemmed in on all sides, perished. The East India Company could not rest under the blow of so terrible a disaster. A fresh army entered the country, devastated it frightfully, and then marched away. That catastrophe was a warning to the English not to spread outside of their peninsula, but rather to fortify themselves in it and allow no independent state to exist there which might serve as the rallying point of a revolt or

of an invasion. In 1843, by the submission of the emirs of Scinde and Baluchistan, they became masters of the mouth of the Indus. On the upper course of that stream they established the system of residents. Thus was indicated the speedy annexation of the Punjab or Country of the Five Rivers, a vast region inhabited by the warlike Sikhs. Six years later the Punjab was united to the other domains of the Company. The famous valley of Cashmere shared the fate of the kingdom of Lahore on which it depended. This was also one of the gates of India. Not far distant, on the right bank of the Scinde, rises the chain of the Bolan Mountains, whence flows the Amu Daria, which empties into the Russian waters of the Sea of Aral. The English wished to close this gate. Thus before 1848 they had a firm hold of the whole course of the Indus. They were trying to submit Afghanistan to their influence, having failed to place it under their control. Meanwhile they were pushing toward the Pamir plateau, the ancient cradle of the European races and the point where the principal mountain ranges of Asia converge.

**The Third Eastern Question. The Pacific Ocean.**—The Pacific Ocean, formerly an untraveled sea, is now the meeting-place of all the navies of the world. Upon its shores dwell ancient and industrious nations, which even in our time have closed their gates with jealous care against foreigners, and youthful colonies of Europeans or Americans which have rapidly become flourishing. Toward the northwest are 400,000,000 Chinese producers and purchasers and nearly 50,000,000 more active Japanese. Toward the southwest are the English colonies of Australia, importing goods the value of which is reckoned by hundreds of millions. The Moluccas or Spice Islands lie between. At the southeast of the Asiatic continent is Cochin-China, where France planted her flag in 1860. Still farther west are the 300,000,000 Hindus, among whom civilization creates wants and from whom it demands products. On the eastern shores of the Pacific stretch the Spanish American republics and the United States. Railways, traversing the whole American continent, connect New York, the great port of

arrival for European goods, with San Francisco. From the latter port steamers sail regularly for Chinese and Japanese waters, where other steamers arrive twice a month from Marseilles and Southampton. Therefore the Pacific Ocean, upon which open the great markets of the world, has in our day acquired a commercial importance like that of the Mediterranean in ancient and mediæval times. An economical revolution has been here accomplished, almost as great as that which followed the discoveries of Columbus and far more rapid, being the creation of hardly a century.

**Age-long Isolation of China and Japan.**—For a long time foreigners knocked at the doors of China. Roman Catholic missionaries went there to evangelize the people as early as 1581. The Portuguese had preceded them and were followed by the Dutch, and then by France and England. The Jesuits succeeded in obtaining due admission at Pekin under the name of literati, and a Russian religious mission was also established. Foreign merchants could only obtain permission to open trading-houses outside the walls of Canton. Such a station Russia had at Kiakhta, where Siberian furs were exchanged for Chinese tea and silk. In vain did England (1793-1806) and Russia (1805) send solemn embassies. The Son of Heaven, as the Chinese emperor was called by himself and his people, required the ambassadors to undergo a humiliating ceremony as condition of their reception. Some refused. Others reached Pekin only as prisoners. All returned without the commercial treaty which they had been commissioned to obtain. In 1828 the Roman Catholic missionaries were expelled, despite the religious toleration professed by the government. China remained walled in. Japan, no less tightly closed, tolerated the presence of the Dutch in the harbor of Nagasaki only on condition of their confining themselves to an island in the roadstead, and permitted no other nation to approach its coast.

**Opium War** (1840-1843).—All the nations, barbarous or civilized, have created for themselves artificial wants and indulgences. Some chew the betel nut, others smoke tobacco, and the Chinese intoxicate themselves with

opium, notwithstanding the injurious effects upon the human system. The English found this vice to their financial advantage. They covered Bengal with fields of poppies and, when the Chinese government strictly prohibited the introduction of opium, organized a vast contraband trade. The Middle Kingdom continued to be inundated with the fatal drug, from which the English made a yearly profit of several million dollars. In 1839 the imperial commissioner ordered 20,000 chests of opium, worth about $18,000,000, to be seized and thrown into the sea. This seizure was legal, and no just claim could be entered against it. But several acts of violence, committed against Englishmen, were seized upon as a pretext. An expedition sent to Chinese waters occupied the island of Chusan and destroyed the forts which commanded the entrance to the river of Canton. The first convention not being ratified, the English made two campaigns to dictate peace under the walls of Nankin. By the treaty of August, 1842, China opened five ports to foreign commerce, ceded Hong Kong to Great Britain, and promised an indemnity of nearly $21,000,000. The two governments in their official declarations continued to treat the opium traffic as illicit. Nevertheless, smuggling was made easy by the opening of the five ports. During the following year 40,000 chests were introduced. This meant a profit of many millions to the landed proprietors of Bengal.

The Russians, meanwhile, had been careful not to displease the court of Pekin. The Tsar Nicholas had severely prohibited the introduction of opium into China through the Russsian frontiers.

France tried to obtain a share in the trade of those regions. In 1844 she sent to China an embassy which signed a commercial treaty and caused the edicts against the Christians to be revoked. Confiscated churches were to be restored and the Roman Catholic missionaries were to enjoy freedom in disseminating their faith wherever they would. Such stipulations were honorable to France. Not only the danger but the distance was relatively greater than in these days of rapid communication. The French government assumed a heavy responsibility in

declaring itself the official protector of Catholic missions among the Chinese.

**Summary. State of the Three Eastern Questions in 1848.**—In the extreme East the two chief antagonists are hardly aware of each other's presence. There the question is hardly more than at the beginning of its initial stage. In Central Asia both Powers have received disastrous checks at the hands of the fierce natives, and neither has fully retrieved its damaged prestige. The English are fortifying themselves behind the mountains and show no present intention of issuing westward through the Bolan or Khaiber Pass. Russia has not yet resumed her march toward Khiva. At Constantinople they are indeed face to face, but there the contest is diplomatic. It is waged by bringing to bear pressure upon the Porte, by successive and short-lived treaties, and by the search for allies among the other European states. Not in China, in Central Asia, nor in the Ottoman Empire have the two rivals met in arms. Nor are they so keenly conscious of their rivalry as they are to become in the succeeding fifty years. Not yet, not even at Constantinople, does any one of the Three Questions reveal all of its ultimate immense importance.

## ANTECEDENTS OF THE REVOLUTION OF 1848

**The Period between 1840 and 1848. Progress of Socialistic Ideas.**—The treaty of the Straits marks a sort of halting-point for Europe. During several subsequent years we see hardly any risings or insurrections. The Powers talk of peace, and order reigns in nearly every state. In England the Tories return to power (1841). Prince Metternich continues his "paternal" rule in Austria. The Tsar Nicholas devotes his energies to organizing Russia like an immense barrack, whence can issue against Europe or Asia armies which he believes invincible. Narvaez recasts for Spain a constitution more monarchical than that of 1837.

France, which nearly every year since 1830 had beheld

a new cabinet, no longer has any ministerial changes. M. Guizot, the prime minister, or president of the council, builds up a conservative party which, convinced that everything is for the best in a social order where it monopolizes the power and honors, believes there is nothing which needs change. A sort of temporary calm is the result. The political agitations of the preceding ten years are followed by the fruitful labors of manufactures and commerce. From one end of Europe to the other nothing is to be heard but the sound of railways in process of construction and of factories which spring up and work with feverish ardor. Financial institutions of all sorts are multiplied. Wealth is accumulated and the exchange regulates business transactions.

And yet this society with its material interests so prosperous is approaching an abyss, because its leaders in their turn believe in the immobility of the world and forget to ask whether there are not other needs which must be satisfied. While official society was content with the tranquillity which reigned in the street and the activity which showed itself in business, the two already old ideas of national and individual independence were making converts. A new idea had risen at their side in the realization that the lot of the laboring classes must be improved.

In Poland and Italy the Russian and the Austrian were still odious. In Bohemia and Hungary the new study of national history and literature revived memories of autonomy which had seemed to be long effaced. Germany dreamed of her unity and of the fatherland. Some of her princes talked about it, for the sake of rendering themselves popular. To this idea the king of Bavaria erected a Walhalla, a Pantheon of all German glories. At Berlin the head of the Hohenzollern lauded "the German country."

After the nationalists came the liberals, some of whom asked for the liberties which had been promised and others claimed the enlargement of liberties already obtained. The inhabitants of the Romagna demanded from the papal government, sometimes with threats as in

1843, a regular administration with a code of laws. Each year the Rhenish provinces expressed a strong desire for a constitution. Even in the Prussian provinces of the Vistula and the Oder liberal tendencies were displayed which caused uneasiness at Berlin. Turin printed a journal whose very title was significant, *Il Risorgimento* or the "Resurrection"; and Count Balbo published his *Speranze d'Italie* (1843). The ambitions of the French opposition party were equally modest and even more legitimate.

But in the darkness a still more formidable faction was forming, which twice already has flooded Paris with blood, made illustrious victims, laid palaces in ashes, and which will, perhaps, long continue to be the terror of Europe, unless wisdom and energy provide a remedy.

The Revolution of 1789, accomplished by and for the burgher class, seemed complete wherever royal despotism and the privileges of birth had disappeared. This double conquest, equality in the eye of the law and the free discussion of national interests, satisfied the ambition of the middle class, every man of which was accustomed to be the architect of his own fortune and asked nothing of the state except assurance of public order without interference in private affairs.

The application of steam to manual trades and the invention of hand-machines, which were first seen in France at the Exposition of 1845, led to a revolution in the mode of manufacture and in the very constitution of labor. Small workshops disappeared and gave way to immense factories, to which the railways brought the inhabitants of the country districts in crowds. In a few years the capitals and the manufacturing or mercantile cities of both hemispheres doubled the number of their inhabitants. In the bosom of these formidable agglomerations of humanity industry was carried to a high degree by the powerful means placed at its disposal, and created great wealth and also great wretchedness.

In order to compete, it was necessary to produce much and to produce cheaply. In other words, longer days were required of the workman, but the wages were so

diminished as to prevent provision against sickness or cessation of work. Hence arose hardships which the utopians, some of whom were generous souls, proposed to suppress by causing indigence to disappear, as the two great miseries of times past, domestic slavery and serfdom, had disappeared. But instead of proceeding gradually, they undertook to change everything at a stroke. Their panacea might cause a thousand evils without even healing one, because their remedies ran counter to the very nature of man and of society. A convent can exist with community of goods or a religious or charitable association depend upon the devotion of each member to the good of all. But under such conditions no regular society is constituted. The Phalansteries and the Icaria, attempted in France, Belgium, Brazil, and Texas, were unsuccessful. But the ignorant populace were not deaf to formulas like the following: "Property is robbery," "Every man has a right to work, even when there is no work to be done, or money wherewith to pay for it," "Wages shall be equal, however unequal the product," "The individual must disappear in a vast solidarity wherein each man will receive according to his needs and will give according to his ability."

These socialistic reveries were put into political action through the alliance of certain republicans with the new sectaries. The latter, to give realization to their dreams, desired to make the state interfere in everything. But as the government was in the hands of the burghers, the first essential was to take it away from them. The masses trouble themselves little about political questions which they do not understand. But, listening eagerly to those who promised them prosperity, they were ready to follow on being told that "social liquidation" could be attained only with a government of their own choice. Thus Socialism, born under the Restoration amid apparently harmless humanitarian utopias, gave existence to a numerous party which included all the poor, and which the logicians of '48 strengthened by decreeing universal suffrage.

This movement was not peculiar to France alone. As

early as 1817 England had had the Chartists, in 1836 the Workingmen's Association, and three years later disturbances in Wales. In 1844 a central association for the welfare of workingmen was formed in Prussia, and grave industrial troubles agitated Silesia and Bohemia. This was the beginning of that war between wages and capital, between the workingman and the employer, which was to break out with violence all over the world.

Of this subterranean ferment, official society, as is often the case, saw nothing. At least it troubled itself little about an evil from which the classes, accustomed for many centuries to suffering, were now suffering. Up to the eve of February 24, 1848, it was occupied with entirely different issues, yet a few months later it found itself obliged to wage a four days' battle with 100,000 men from the poorer classes.

**France from 1840 to 1846.**—The history of France during these years lies far more in the obscure facts just mentioned than in those stirring events of the time which a quarter of a century had sufficed to restore to their true proportions. This was a golden age of orators. Much eloquence was expended and only small things were done.

The national feeling had been profoundly wounded by the events of 1840. M. Guizot, as a compensation to French pride, caused the sterile rocks of the Marquesas Islands in the Pacific Ocean to be occupied (May, 1842). New Zealand was more valuable. France was on the point of seizing it when England took possession of it first. A French officer planted the flag of France upon the great oceanic island of New Caledonia. The ministry had it torn down. The states of Honduras and Nicaragua asked for the protection of France. Hayti wished to do the same. This protection was refused and the refusal was apparently inspired by England. Though France acquired the Society Islands, her commercial interests in those regions were not great enough to necessitate an imposing establishment. The acquisition of Mayotte (1843) was a wiser operation, because that islet provided French ships a better haven than the island of Bourbon could afford them and a naval

station in the vicinity of Madagascar. At Tahiti an Englishman named Pritchard, at once consul, missionary, and apothecary, stirred up the natives against France. The unworthy agent was driven from the island (1844). His complaints were listened to in Parliament, and the French Cabinet demanded from the Chambers an indemnity for the intriguer who had caused the shedding of blood. The official disavowal of Rear-Admiral Dupetit Thouars, who had tried to extend the French establishment in Oceanica, increased the public irritation. This disavowal was regarded as a humiliation before the British government. A more serious concession, made to the English, was the recognition of England's right of search for the suppression of the slave trade. This time the opposition was so vigorous throughout the land that the Chamber forced the minister to repudiate the treaty and, by fresh conventions, to place the French merchant marine once more under the exclusive protection of the national flag (May, 1845).

The Chamber and public opinion desired the conquest of Algeria to be completed. The ministry had the merit of choosing an energetic and skillful man, General Bugeaud, who was able to inspire the Arabs with both respect and terror. Abd-el Kader was preaching a holy war and by the rapidity of his movements had spread terror through the province of Oran and even to the gates of Algiers. The emir was defeated and his family and flocks were captured. Taking refuge in Morocco he prevailed on the emperor of that country to join his cause. It reply France bombarded Tangiers and Mogador and gained the victory of Isly. The emperor was glad to sign a treaty of peace on easy conditions.

The Anglo-French alliance was of no direct advantage to France, but was supposed to assure the general tranquillity. Louis Philippe sought above all the welfare of his family. Marrying his son, the Duke of Montpensier, to the sister of the Spanish queen, he aroused the resentment of the British, who considered that the king was seeking to render France and his dynasty preponderant in the peninsula. Alarmed at the alienation of England and the general isolation of

France, the ministry made advances to Austria, and in order to win her favor sacrificed Switzerland and Italy. The former wished to remodel her constitution and give more authority to the central power. Such a change would have benefited France, whose frontier would be better protected by a strong than by a divided Switzerland. But this reform, urged by the Liberals, was opposed by the seven Roman Catholic cantons. M. Guizot went so far as to accept the diplomatic intervention of the foreign Powers, although that might be followed by military intervention. However, the Separatists or Sonderbund, whom he favored, were defeated in a nineteen days' campaign, and the Jesuits were expelled (November, 1847).

On the banks of the Po the Austrians had occupied Ferrara. Pope Pius IX, who was then arousing Italy from her torpor, protested and was not supported. At Milan the Austrian garrison committed outrages in February, 1848. M. Guizot contented himself with negotiations in favor of the victims. Thus France became the ally of an empire which maintained itself only by causing the various peoples which it held in servitude to oppress each other. When the opposition complained, the minister replied by pointing to the national prosperity. Popular instruction was developing, the penal code had been modified, and lotteries suppressed. The law of appropriation for public purposes rendered it possible to carry on works of public utility without hindrance from private interests. Industry sprang into life and vigor, commerce extended its domain, the seacoasts were lined with lighthouses, the public roads were improved, and the construction of a vast network of railways was decided upon. This prosperity, as often happens, gave rise to frantic speculation. The evil was of wide scope. One of the king's ministers was condemned for having sold his signature, and a peer of France for having bought it.

The elections of 1846 were carefully manipulated by the administration and gave it a majority. But among the deputies chosen were many officials. It became evident that in the very small class of electors, who num-

bered only 220,000, political feeling hardly existed and that calculation was taking the place of patriotism. Electors sold their votes to deputies. The persons elected sold their support to the ministers. Thus the representative system was vitiated at its source. Hence a ministry, rejected by public opinion, was retained in power by an artificial majority.

**England. Free Trade. The Income Tax and the New Colonial System** (1841-1849).—Such resistance was very impolitic at a moment when liberal ideas, though repressed by the governments, were everywhere springing up again. The leader of the Tories, Sir Robert Peel, had kept his ministry in office from 1841 to 1846 only by becoming more of a reformer than the Whigs. Snatching from his adversaries their own weapons, the ideas of Huskisson and Canning, he abolished the corn laws, favored free trade, and reëstablished the income tax. In this manner he destroyed what had been looked upon as the cornerstone of aristocratic power. He abolished the Navigation Act, which had served to establish the maritime greatness of his country, but which had already become a piece of warlike machinery fit only for a place among other antiquated machines. Lastly, he made the rich pay in order that the poor might live cheaply.

Centuries had been required for the parliamentary institutions of Great Britain to react upon other governments. But only a short time was necessary for Sir Robert Peel's economical revolution to issue from the island where it had its birth. Enacted in the name of the principles of free trade and applied to the greatest market of the world, it possessed a character of universal expansion. This great act, which presented such a contrast to the trivial anxieties of France, was destined accordingly to exercise a great influence over the custom-house legislation of the continent. But things are bound together. The triumph of liberty in the realm of economics necessarily paves the way for its victory in the realm of politics.

Already, under the control of these ideas, England had renounced the colonial system which modern Europe

had inherited from ancient Rome and which some states still retain. She no longer sought the absolute domination of the mother country over her colonies that they, like docile slaves, might exist only for her, and toil, produce, and purchase for her profit. That outworn system had cost North America to the English; South America to the Spanish and the Portuguese; and Canada and Louisiana to the French. To the new system England was led, moreover, by her own genius. Reserving to the mother country only the appointment of a governor, the colonies were allowed to manage their own affairs by a legislative body elected by themselves. Thus was developed the prosperity of the colonists and that of the mother country. The constitutional liberty granted to Canada was productive of marvelous progress. All the English colonies, with the exception of India and the purely military outposts, found themselves endowed with this fruitful liberty in 1849. Liberty is not only a noble thing, but is also a useful thing. Thus England could abolish some of her taxes, while in the ten years between 1832 and 1842 her commerce nearly doubled. The budget of the continental states showed a deficit, while that of England presented a surplus.

England does not like revolutions. Her government resembles a skillful pilot who always keeps an eye on the horizon to discern the great currents and steer the ship into them. So, since 1832, she escaped political storms by following the impulse of the public mind. Thus between 1822 and 1826 Huskisson's reforms were accomplished. In 1829 came Roman Catholic emancipation. In 1832 electoral reform was decreed. In 1841 the income tax was revised, not indeed as a war measure, but for the purpose of freeing from all imposts bread, beer, and the raw materials which feed manufactures. In 1846 the corn laws were suppressed and free trade established. For these reasons England escaped bloodshed and revolution.

**Establishment of the Constitutional System in Prussia.** (1847).—In the time of Voltaire and Montesquieu echoes from the House of Commons rarely crossed the Channel and reached only a few superior men. Now, thanks to

the press, they were heard everywhere and awoke and excited men's minds. In 1845 the states of Silesia, of the grand duchy of Posen, and of royal Prussia demanded freedom of the press, publicity of debate, and a penal code in accordance with the principles of modern legislation. The king refused everything. To those who asked for a constitution, he replied that he would never allow a sheet of paper to interpose between his people and himself. Two years later he was obliged to convoke a general Diet, although he was willing to recognize in it solely a consultative character. But the Diet claimed the right of receiving the annual account of the administration of the public debt and of deliberating upon all general laws, including taxation. At once it arrogated to itself the superintendence of the finances with legislative power. To guarantee against all surprises it declared in advance that it would recognize in no other assembly or commission, even if sprung from its own ranks, the right of exercising its functions. Thus the constitutional system was set up in Berlin. Only two great states, Austria and Russia, were left to represent unyielding opposition to the new ideas.

**Liberal Agitations in Austria and Italy.**—Nevertheless, the general movement was invading even seemingly changeless Austria. In Styria and Carinthia, her oldest duchies, men worked for reforms. In Hungary a great constitutional party was already organized. Bohemia also was in a ferment. But, as the country was divided between two hostile populations, the Germans and the Czechs, Prince Metternich was able to rely upon the one to resist the other. In 1847 he deprived the state of Bohemia of the right to vote the taxes.

His policy had just suffered a signal check on the western frontier of the empire, by the prompt defeat of the Sonderbund which he had tried to save. The victory of the Swiss Liberals was only one more bad example given to the docile subjects of the Hapsburgs and did not constitute a danger. But on the other side of the Alps a storm was muttering, all the more threatening because this time the tempest came from Rome.

The disastrous attempt of the Bandiera brothers, sons

of an Austrian admiral, who tried to stir up the Calabrians in 1844, and the insurrection of Rimini in 1845, undertaken to obtain the application of the Memorandum of the Great Powers in 1831, had been the last appeals to arms on the part of the Italians. But what the propaganda of gunshots did not succeed in effecting, the propaganda of ideas brought about among that intelligent people. Gioberti, with his book, *Del primato . . . degli Italiani*, in 1843 had won over a part of the clergy to the national cause. Later on he had tried in the *Modern Jesuit* to remove the Pope from the fatal influence of "the degenerate sons of Loyola." Father Ventura, a famous preacher, exclaimed: "If the Church does not march with the age, the nations will not halt, but they will march on without the Church, outside the Church, against the Church." What pontiff would be capable of comprehending that religion must be reconciled with liberty! The Italians believed they had found such a Pope, a reformer for the universal Church and a national ruler for Italy, in Pius IX, elected in June, 1846. At the very beginning he dismissed his Swiss guard, threw open the prisons, recalled the exiles, subjected the clergy to taxation, and prepared the way for reform in the civil and criminal laws. He instituted an assembly of notables, chosen by himself, but possessing only a consultative voice. He created a Council of State, restored municipal institutions to Rome, and for the first time published the budget of the papal states. The king of Sardinia and the Grand Duke of Tuscany followed his example. Italy again revived with the double hope of regaining her political liberty and her national independence. On December 5, 1846, fires were kindled from one end of the Apennines to the other. The hundredth anniversary of a defeat of the Austrians before Genoa was being celebrated to the cry of, "Expel the barbarians!" "*Fuori i barbari!*" England, governed after June, 1846, by the Whig ministry of Lord Russell, sent the Mediterranean fleet into Sicilian waters, and Lord Minto, her ambassador, traveled all over Italy urging the princes into constitutional paths. The opposition in the French Chamber cried aloud to the Pope,

" Courage, Holy Father! Courage! " But the Cabinet of the Tuileries, while favorable to administrative reforms, discouraged political reforms, so as to keep on good terms with Austria, alliance with whom seemed necessary in consequence of the Spanish marriages.

By joining in the liberal movement Austria might have restrained and guided it; but that Power was still under the fatal influence of the party, which accused " the carbonaro Mastaï " of having usurped the Holy See by intrigue. She addressed to the Pope a severe note against his reforms in June, 1847, fomented a conspiracy in Rome itself, and, contrary to all treaties, occupied the city of Ferrara in August. Cardinal Ferretti sent to Vienna an energetic protest, which was backed up by the courts of Turin and Florence, but of which M. Guizot expressed disapprobation. " Father Ventura," said Pius IX, discouraged, " France is deserting us. We are alone! " " No, we are not alone," replied the Theatine monk, " God is with us. Forward! "

And Italy did move forward. At the end of November the Roman Council opened. Leopold II and Charles Albert effected reforms which were equivalent to the promise of a constitution and their ministers signed with the Papal Cabinet an alliance " for the development of Italian industry and the welfare of the peoples " on November 3. The Duke of Modena and the king of the Two Sicilies were invited to adhere to the treaty. This union was a threat against Austria, to which she replied by the military occupation of Parma and Moderna in December. The extremities of Italy immediately caught fire.

Three months previously an insurrection at Reggio and Messina and a disturbance in Naples had been severely put down, but promises of reform had been made. On January 12, 1848, as these reforms had not been effected, Palermo took up arms to the cry of, " Long live Pius IX." On the 16th the insurrection had mastered the whole island. On the 18th 10,000 men marched upon Naples demanding, as in 1821, a constitution. On the 28th Ferdinand II yielded; two weeks later a charter, modeled on the French charter of 1830, was promulgated

at Naples, and four days afterwards at Florence, and on March 4 at Turin.

The Italian peoples were quivering with excitement, especially in the Lombardo-Venetian territory, where exasperation against the Austrian had seized even the women and children. On January 3 Austrian dragoons put to the sword groups of people in the streets of Milan. Troubles broke out in Pavia and Padua on February 8; on the 15th at Bergamo. On the 22d Marshal Radetzki proclaimed martial law at Milan. Almost at the same moment a revolution burst out at Paris which, seventeen days later, found its echo in Vienna. Nothing remained to Austria in Italy at the end of March except the fortresses of the quadrilateral.

The general situation of Europe at the beginning of the year 1848 indicated that the critical hour had come. After a struggle, lasting more than a generation, between the old régime and liberal ideas, the latter felt themselves strong enough to look upon their approaching triumph as sure.

## AMERICA FROM 1815 TO 1848

**American Progress. The Monroe Doctrine.**—During all this period the New World furnished little to general history. Spanish America writhed for a long time in periodical convulsions, the fruit of a double despotism under which the political education of the citizens was impossible. Portuguese America was slowly developing her riches and her population, under the protection of a constitutional government. Canada prospered through liberty. The United States, having behind them no past to arrest their movements or excite their violence, and having before them infinite space, were engaged in expending upon nature the forces of an exuberant youth without yet turning those forces against themselves, as in the old states of the European West. Faithful to the institutions with which they had endowed themselves, they tilled the prairies, cleared the forests, and covered the

Copyright, 1898, by T. Y. Crowell & Co.

Engraved by Colton, Ohman & Co., N. Y.

Indians' hunting-grounds with cities to which flocked a population that often doubled itself in twenty years.

Lest they be disturbed in this work they had used very independent language toward Europe. After having recognized in 1821 the independence of the Spanish colonies, President Monroe, in 1823, in a message to the Senate, established the principle which has remained the rule of the Cabinet at Washington in its foreign policy. "The American continents . . . are not to be considered as subjects for colonization by European powers. . . . We should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. Any such interference would be regarded as the manifestation of an unfriendly spirit to the United States." This declaration—the now famous Monroe Doctrine—was renewed in decided terms when the success of the French invasion of Spain aroused fear of an attempt at restoration in Buenos Ayres, Lima, or Mexico. The Old World, separated from the New by 1500 leagues of sea, dared not accept the challenge.

Since the war of 1812-1815 against England, the United States had been at peace with Europe. Though the European courts received from Washington nothing but proposals for treaties of commerce or the regulation of unimportant matters, the spectacle of that nation waxing great day by day with the most liberal institutions in the world was contagious to the society of the Old Continent. Every year the latter sent across the ocean many thousands of their poor in quest of land and liberty. Every year, also, there returned engineers, merchants, and politicians who had admired on the banks of the Ohio and Mississippi the power of individual energy. The tales which were told concerning the greatness of the American republic encouraged the Liberal party and made it desire still more to limit the rights of the state and advance the rights of the citizens.

This young republic lacked, it is true, many of the elegances and distinctions of old societies where aristocracy has left behind something of its refined manners, of its tastes for the arts, and of its sentiment of honor

which is a sort of personal religion. In haste to live and to enjoy life, the Americans advanced little beyond the useful. But the useful is one of the two necessities of life. The other, the ideal, was sure to come later on with hereditary wealth and leisure. Some day they would no longer be obliged to say, "Time is money." Some day, when their soil was placed under cultivation and their railways and canals were completed, they would devote time to solitary meditation, to pure art, to theoretical science, and, in a word, to all the glorious but immaterial pursuits which make great peoples.

Reading this history of Europe and of the New World between 1815 and 1848, it would seem as if kings and peoples all had but one idea during those three and thirty years; as if they sought only either to destroy or to save political liberty. Nevertheless, men's minds were occupied with art, poetry, science, thought, religion, and a thousand matters besides. Manufactures and commerce were in process of transformation. Useful reforms were brought about. The general welfare increased. Ignorance and crime were on the decrease. In short, almost everywhere there was security for property and persons. But under absolute government those great and beneficent things which they enjoyed lacked guarantees and could possess them only under constitutional government. Civil liberty is indispensable for every citizen. Each individual needs it that he may live like a man. Political liberty, on the contrary, would be merely a luxury, necessary to a few but useless to the majority, if, like a faithful guardian of a house, it were not there for the purpose of giving warning when thieves approach and of preventing their entrance. Since its part is to assure the safety of our welfare, we must draw the inference that, the richer and happier societies are, so much the greater is the fruitful development of the active faculties and so much the more indispensable is political liberty. It is the only pledge that their welfare shall endure. For this reason it was, and deserved to be, the object of the great battle which we are here sketching so rapidly.

## THE REVOLUTION OF 1848

The victory of liberal Switzerland and of the constitutional party in Prussia, the agitation of Germany, Hungary, and the Austrian duchies, the conduct of Pius IX, and the efforts of Italy to escape from the despotism of her rulers as well as from the grip of the Hapsburgs, had caused an immense sensation in France. In the legislative body the deputies of the Left Center and of the Dynastic Left, led by MM. Thiers and Odilon Barrot, called upon the ministry to fulfill its promises. They demanded the modification of certain taxes, and electoral and parliamentary reform. The latter had been proposed in vain at each session since 1842. The ministry rejected these harmless demands and ridiculed the opposition for its ineffectual efforts to awake the country from political torpor. Then the national complaints found a voice. They deplored the degradation of France, which no longer possessed its legitimate influence in Europe. They showed how the most legitimate reforms had been refused, and denounced the electoral and parliamentary corruption fostered by the government. Their demands were most moderate. They asked only the addition of 25,000 persons to the voters and that government officials should be refused membership in the Chamber. The President of the Council of Paris began the battle by causing the king in his speech at the opening of the session on December 20, 1848, to declare 100 deputies enemies of the throne.

Debates kept public opinion in an uproar. The opposition made a final demonstration by appointing a banquet in the twelfth district. The republicans who had long been discouraged let things go on without opposition, but held themselves in readiness. "If the ministry authorizes the banquet," said one of their leaders on February 20, "it will fall. If it prohibits it, there will be a revolution." The Dynastic Left made a last effort to forestall the explosion. On February 21 M. Odilon

Barrot laid upon the table of the Chamber an accusation against the ministers.

The latter prevented the banquet. Immediately vast crowds got together and here and there conflicts broke out. But on February 23 the opposition had won its case. A Liberal ministry was appointed under the presidency of M. Thiers. A shot was fired by an unknown person at the guardhouse of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The troops replied by a discharge which killed fifty innocent promenaders. At the sight of these dead bodies borne into the city, the people of the faubourgs shouted, "They are assassinating our brethren! Vengeance!" and flew to arms. The king believed he could count upon the army, commanded by General Bugeaud. That energetic leader had already taken measures to quell the riot, when, during the night of the 23d, he received orders from the president of the new ministry to fall back with his troops upon the Tuileries. Rather than obey he resigned his command, and the resistance was paralyzed. The national guard had been tardily assembled. They believed that the whole matter would be confined to a change of ministers, and allowed the movement to go on. But real revolution followed. Soon they tried to arrest what their inactivity had aided, but it was too late. Even the Order of the National Guard, which dated from July 14, 1789, was morally overthrown on February 24. Abandoned by the burghers of Paris, Louis Philippe thought he was deserted by all France. At noon he abdicated, while fighting was still going on at the Palais Royal. He departed under the protection of several regiments without being either pursued or disturbed.

The Duke of Orleans, whose influence over the army had been great, was dead. The Prince de Joinville and the Duke d'Aumale, who enjoyed a well-earned popularity, were absent. There remained in addition to the Duke de Montpensier, who was still too young to be known, only a woman and a child, the Duchess of Orleans and the Count of Paris. The duchess, respected for her virtues and lofty spirit, but a stranger and alone, had no power. While the populace was entering the

Tuileries, she went to the Chamber with the Count of Paris. The insurgents followed her here and caused a provisional government to be proclaimed.

Thus, through the incapacity of the government and the audacity of a faction, instead of legal accomplishment of requisite reforms, the monarchy was overthrown. The successful insurrection was to paralyze labor, waste hundreds of millions of francs, and divert the country far from the path of peaceful progress.

Copyright, 1898, by T. Y. Crowell & Co.

Engraved by Colton, Ohman & Co., N. Y.

# CONTEMPORARY HISTORY

## THE REVOLUTION OF 1848 IN ITS INFLUENCE UPON EUROPE

**Contemporary History.**—The term "contemporary" may well be applied to the history of the world since 1848. This period possesses a distinct character of its own. While preëminent in its scientific and humanitarian achievements, it has specially contributed to political progress, not so much in what it has originated as by what it has developed. More than most periods of like duration, it is the direct consummation of the years immediately preceding. It differs from them as the harvest differs from the seed-time.

Its most memorable achievements in the domain of politics have been along the lines of constitutional government and unification of nationality. Yet here as everywhere else human attainment is partial and incomplete, but these two contributions to the advance of humanity will be prominent as we narrate its story. Because we are so near the events to be described and because the sources of information are so many, the narration will be difficult. As contemporaries of these events we are ourselves tossed by the billows on which we gaze.

**Outbreak at Vienna and Fall of Metternich.**—The progress of the public mind is indicated as we compare the effect produced in foreign countries by the successive French revolutions of 1789, 1830, and 1848. The first revolution was attended nowhere by any immediate popular uprising and apparently concerned only the kings. The second caused commotions and renewed demands for constitutions in some of the smaller states, but the disturbances were soon repressed. The third came upon

Europe as an electric shock. West of Russia and of the Ottoman Empire every state was convulsed.

Reactionary Austria, of whose policy the astute Metternich had been for almost forty years at once the incarnation and the champion, was among the first to feel its effects. The Provincial Estates of Lower Austria were only the phantom of a deliberative assembly without power or influence. But they served as a rallying point to the excited populace of Vienna, destitute of organization or of a center. The Estates were to convene on the 13th of March, seventeen days after the fall of Louis Philippe. When they assembled the whole city was in an uproar. Immense crowds, headed by students, surrounded the hall. They demanded that the Estates should be their messengers to the emperor and should make the following demands: regular publication of the state budget, open session of the courts, freedom of the press, reform in municipal administration, and a general parliament to which all classes should be eligible. The terrified Estates called the troops to their assistance. A hand-to-hand fight raged through the streets between the soldiers and the people, and many lives were lost. The tumult constantly increased, but the citizens could not reach the imbecile Emperor Ferdinand IV, who was kept in concealment. The battle-cry was "Down with Metternich!" The veteran statesman was forsaken by all his colleagues. At last he saw that resistance was useless. On the following day he escaped from the capital in a laundry cart. The emperor was induced by his attendants to give a verbal grant of all that the revolutionists demanded, but Vienna was placed under martial law. Finally, on April 25, an illusory constitution was proclaimed. Three weeks later the emperor fled to Innsbruck. Nevertheless his authority seemed at no time endangered. Metternich fallen, the people supposed that everything was gained.

**Troubles in Bohemia.**—The Bohemians had acted even more quickly. On March 11, at a public meeting in Prague, they drew up a petition, asking, however, little more than improvement in the condition of the peasants and a general system of public instruction. The news

from Vienna made them bolder. The students formed an academic legion. A few days later a second petition demanded reconstitution of the Bohemian crown, a Bohemian Diet, a Bohemian ministry, and full equality between the Slavs and the Germans in the kingdom. A committee was sent to convey these demands to Vienna, where it was well received; but in the constitution promulgated on April 25 all their claims were ignored. The irritation of the Czechs became intense. A congress of all the Slavic peoples assembled at Prague. Its chief object was to secure recognition of the race rather than the rights of individuals. To such recognition the government and all the other nationalities of the empire were bitterly opposed. Prague was captured by the imperial troops and martial law proclaimed.

**Revolt in Hungary.**—A movement, in some respects similar to that in Prague, was meanwhile in progress under the lead of Kossuth at Presburg and Pesth. There, however, the desire for reforms was subordinate to the still stronger desire for emancipation from Austria. Its dominant motive was the sentiment of awakened Hungarian nationality. But it in no way included antagonism to the sovereign, to whom on many occasions the Magyars have shown a loyalty surpassing that of the Austrians. Nor did it include recognition of the just demands of the various Slavic and other peoples who constituted a large proportion of the population. In April Ferdinand IV granted whatever was asked, practically recognizing Hungary as an autonomous state with himself as its sovereign. Count Batthyany was authorized to form the first Hungarian ministry.

These measures discontented the Slavs, especially the Servians and Croatians. The newly appointed Ban of Croatia, Jellachich, took up arms, proclaiming his opposition to those "who want liberty only for themselves and who wish to monopolize for the Magyar minority the treasures acquired by the sweat of the Slavs, the Germans, and the Rumanians." A partisan of absolute rule and apparently in secret alliance with the emperor, Jellachich marched upon Pesth. Batthyany resigned, but Kossuth was appointed to organize the national de-

fense. His volunteers defeated the Ban. The Viennese, through hatred of the Slavs, showed a momentary passionate sympathy for the Hungarians. They rose against the government on October 7, and begged the assistance of the Hungarians against Jellachich, who now threatened Vienna. The new allies arrived too late, for the capital had been already stormed and the ringleaders put to death. Jellachich was appointed generalissimo. Now, in behalf of the emperor, he was about to turn his arms against the Hungarians, who boasted meanwhile that they were "faithful to the sovereign beloved by Hungary." Feeble-minded and exhausted, Ferdinand gladly abdicated in favor of his nephew, Francis Joseph. The Magyars refused to accept this abdication and their excessive loyalty gave them the attitude of rebels.

**Commotions in Italy.**—Piedmont was independent, but Austria dominated almost all the rest of Italy by her arms or influence. Lombardy and Venice were subject provinces. The Milanese rose, and on March 18 they forced Radetzki, the Austrian commander, to evacuate the city and retreat to Verona. At Venice the Austrians seemed paralyzed. Daniel Manin was made the chief of the provisional government which proclaimed the Republic of Saint Mark. The fire of insurrection rapidly spread. Soon only a few fortresses were left on the Mincio and Adige, where Radetzki was resolved to hold out to the last. Forced by the clamors of his people Charles Albert, king of Piedmont, on March 26 entered Milan to support the revolution.

Rome and Florence were still racked by the agitations of the preceding year. The news of the French Revolution came like a wind upon smoldering embers. Pius IX was affrighted at the sweep of principles with which by nature he was in sympathy. But he granted the Romans a constitution and a government by two Chambers, and called his sagacious counselor, Rossi, to the ministry. The Grand Duke of Tuscany hesitated but seemed to incline toward reform. The king of Naples, Ferdinand II, endeavored to temporize with his subjects, though granting a constitution and creating a united parliament

for Naples and Sicily. The revolutionist Pepe even persuaded him to send an army of 13,000 Neapolitans to the assistance of Charles Albert. The impetuous Sicilians rejected all overtures from their sovereign and declared themselves independent.

**Popular Demands in Prussia and Other German States.**—In Baden, Würtemberg, Saxony, and western Germany repressed liberal sentiment at once found expression. Everywhere there were demonstrations, sometimes tumultuous and often violent. In Bavaria the people forced Louis I to abdicate. But Berlin was the center of agitation. There the fall of Metternich, the recognized exponent of the autocratic system, produced even more profound impression than in Vienna. Excited crowds filled the streets. In public meetings the popular grievances were incessantly and earnestly set forth.

Frederick William IV was slow in deciding whether to resist or to put himself at the head of the universal demonstration. Finally, on March 18, a royal edict announced that the king would favor the introduction of constitutional government into every German state and the establishment of a parliament wherein all Germany should be represented. The rejoicing citizens by thousands flocked to the palace. Their cheers were mistaken for an attack and the troops discharged their guns upon the defenseless masses. At once the burghers all over the city flew to arms. Nor was the riot suppressed until more than 200 citizens had been slain and as many soldiers killed or wounded in consequence of a terrible blunder. When order was restored, the king by a dramatic act gained immense popularity. At the head of a solemn procession he rode through the streets, ostentatiously wearing the gold, white, and black, the colors he had formerly proscribed and which were the symbols of the German Fatherland. He furthermore announced that he assumed the leaderhip in the great work of German unification. Union was even dearer to the German heart than was liberty. But, in addition, the sovereign promised radical and comprehensive reforms in the whole system of government and administration.

**The German National Assembly.**—A few days later, in response to a general invitation, several hundred liberals met at Frankfort to prepare the draft of a constitution and formulate measures to be submitted to the forthcoming National Assembly. They frittered away their strength in political maneuvers and retarded rather than strengthened the triumph of principles they should have advanced. Meanwhile, everywhere throughout the German states the deputies were being chosen for the National Assembly. On May 18 they held their first session in the newly erected church of Saint Paul at Frankfort. That was the most inspiring political gathering Germany had ever beheld. It was composed of her most patriotic and illustrious sons. In its promise this was the golden day of German history.

## THE SECOND FRENCH REPUBLIC

### (1848-1852)

**The Provisional Government.**—The provisional government of the second French republic was installed by the mob on the day of revolution, and its title to authority was based upon the submission with which for a time its orders were received. The provinces as usual acquiesced in the government set up at the capital. The eloquent orator, Lamartine, was at the head as minister of foreign affairs and Ledru-Rollin was minister of the interior. The latter was a radical. The other ministers were moderate republicans. This suddenly improvised government was without cohesion or plan. Yet, while ruling as a despotic oligarchy, it seemed ardently though vaguely desirous of doing something noble. In order to furnish occupation to the unemployed it set up national workshops and guaranteed work with pay or pay without work to every citizen. Soon it had on its roll the names of over 120,000 men, one-half of the laboring population of Paris. Meanwhile, it supplied bread to their families in proportion to the number of children. Private enterprise became disorganized, and those evils increased

which the national workshops were designed to cure.

Universal suffrage had been proclaimed. On April 23 elections were held all over France for the choice of deputies to a national assembly. Ten days later the Assembly met. It reaffirmed the Republic and commended the provisional government, most of whose members it reappointed to office as an executive commission. The Socialist leaders of Paris raised mobs and endeavored to seize the power, but their first attempt was put down by the national guard. The national workshops had become the greatest menace to the state. The Assembly ordered that all the younger men enrolled in them should enlist in the army or cease to receive pay.

**The Barricades.**—Then broke out a fearful insurrection at Paris. Barricades were suddenly erected all over the eastern part of the city and were defended with military precision by the rioters. In the emergency General Cavaignac, the minister of war, was appointed dictator. The pitched battle of the streets began June 23 and lasted four days. However disguised by party names, it was a conflict between the penniless and the moneyed classes and a menace to the rights of property. The insurgents held their ground with savage courage and were not subdued until 8000 persons had been slain and 12,000 taken prisoners. Among the victims were two deputies, seven generals, and the venerable archbishop of Paris, Monseigneur Affre. Horrified at the fratricidal slaughter he had climbed a barricade, where the fighting was hottest, and was shot down while imploring the combatants to throw away their arms.

**General Discontent.**—The frightful victory left the government not the less humiliated and weakened. Apprehension and discontent pervaded all classes, not only at Paris but throughout France. The masses were sullen because none of the social utopias, prophesied so often of late, had been realized. The well-to-do classes were panic-stricken at the peril property had just undergone and at future perils in store. The state revenues diminished, therefore taxation increased. But commerce and

manufactures were paralyzed in the absence of confidence, and it was more difficult to pay.

The Assembly hastily laid the foundations of a new constitution. It confided the executive power to a president, elected for three years by universal suffrage and responsible only to the people. It confided the legislative power to a single chamber, elected to hold office for four years. In the president was vested all power of appointment in the various branches of administration. He was to negotiate treaties and exercise an indefinite control of the army, but he could not take command of the troops or dissolve the Assembly or veto a measure which he disapproved. His power was either too little or too great. While declared ineligible for a second term of office, it would not be difficult with the means at his disposal to regain or retain the presidential authority were he so disposed.

The two chief candidates for the presidency were General Cavaignac and Prince Louis Napoleon. The former was a consistent republican, a soldier rather than a statesman, and the conqueror of the barricades. But the victory, won with the blood of Frenchmen, rendered him unpopular even with his own party. The latter was the nephew and heir of Napoleon. All his life an exile from France, he had returned on the fall of Louis Philippe, but when the provisional government requested him to leave the country, he had complied. In June, elected to the Assembly in four different departments, he had resigned, though reserving his liberty of action. Elected in September by five departments, he no longer withdrew, but took his seat. The romance of his personal history, his manifest calmness and self-control, and above all, the magic of the great name he bore, made him a formidable candidate. His electoral address to the nation was a model of tact and shrewdness. He received 5,434,226 votes, while General Cavaignac could secure only 1,448,107.

**Presidency of Louis Napoleon.**—His first year in office was marked only by the expedition to Rome, the election of a new Assembly, and a presidential message, memorable for its energetic and even agressive tone. The sec-

ond year the inevitable divergence between the chief magistrate and the legislative body became more marked. The Assembly was composed of nearly equal groups of Legitimists, Orleanists, and Republicans. The two former regarded the actual government as a makeshift or usurpation, which was to give way eventually to the coronation of the Bourbon, Henry, Count of Chambord, or of Louis Philippe, Count of Paris, grandson of the deposed king. All their energies were devoted to that end.

Public opinion overwhelmingly demanded revision of that clause of the constitution which declared a president ineligible to reëlection. Less than two-thirds of the Assembly voted for revision, but it could be carried only by a vote of three-fourths. In May a decree had been passed which deprived over 3,000,000 Frenchmen of the right of suffrage. It was a fair charge that the Assembly had destroyed universal suffrage and, by refusing to revise the constitution, had denied the people the exercise of choice. The third year was spent in irritating discussions and political maneuvering on both sides. On November 4, 1851, the president demanded the repeal of the law which restricted the suffrage. The Bill of Repeal was defeated by seven votes. Between president and Assembly it was henceforth a question which should first be able to overthrow the other.

**The Coup d'État** (December 2, 1851).—The Assembly was at the disadvantage of being a many-headed, many-minded body. Louis Napoleon could take his measures with the effectiveness of profound secrecy. On the evening of December 1 he held the customary thronged reception at the Palace of the Élysée. Nothing in his bearing betrayed preoccupation or excitement. At the usual hour he withdrew and closeted himself with his half-brother, De Morny, the minister of war, St. Arnaud, and the prefect of the police, De Maupas. They alone were acquainted with his plans and upon them depended their execution. Before daybreak every formidable opponent of the president had been arrested, the principal quarters of Paris occupied by guards, and dispatches sent out to the 40,000 communes of France an-

nouncing what had been done. Innumerable manifestoes, everywhere attached to the walls, proclaimed that the president on his own responsibility had dissolved the Assembly, restored universal suffrage, and appealed to the people to express its verdict on his acts in a plebiscite to be held within two weeks. He proposed a new constitution which provided for a senate, council of state, and legislative chamber, and which lengthened the presidential term to ten years. A glowing proclamation was also addressed to the army.

A portion of the Assembly on the next day endeavored to hold a session, but the deputies were arrested. Disturbances broke out in various parts of the capital and in the provinces, but were quickly suppressed. Sixty-six radical deputies were exiled as well as a number of monarchists. But Paris, as well as France in general, received the news of the coup d'état with indifference or satisfaction.

## TRIUMPH OF REACTION IN EUROPE

**Subjugation of Hungary.**—The real ruler of Austria in December, 1848, was Prince Schwartzenberg, the head of the ministry. His political principles differed little from those of Metternich. He proposed to tolerate no reforms save such as should be extorted and to reduce all other ambitions in the empire to complete subjection to the Austrian Germans. Austria, in its medley of races and of débris of other states, has always been the most heterogeneous power in Europe. By a playing off of race against race and utilizing each to overthrow some other, Schwartzenberg proposed to attain his ends.

The Hungarians regarded the new emperor as a usurper, and hence must be reduced to subjection. Though fighting to preserve Magyar independence of Austria and to maintain the concessions granted them by Ferdinand, they treated their subjects in their Transylvanian and Slavic provinces as oppressively as the Austrians had treated them. The Austrian general, Puchner,

subdued Transylvania. Windischgrätz, with the main army, invaded western Hungary and captured Pesth. Dissensions speedily broke out between the orator Kossuth, the head of the committee of defense, and General Görgei, commander of the army. Kossuth removed Görgei and appointed a Pole, the incapable Dembinski, to the chief command. The Austrians won a series of successes, but Schwartzenberg alienated the Slavs, who offered to unite with their hereditary foes, but the Hungarians rejected their overtures. Görgei was restored to his command and he and Bem swept the invaders from the country, leaving only a few fortresses in their hands. The Hungarian Diet declared that the house of Hapsburg had forfeited its rights to the throne and that Hungary was henceforth an independent state. Austria had been thoroughly defeated. The only resource left her was to entreat the willing intervention of the Russian Tsar.

Eighty thousand Russians entered from the north while equally overwhelming forces marched from the south and east. The Hungarians, though constantly defeated, fought heroically against hopeless odds. General Klapka made a magnificent defense at Komorn. The last battle was fought at Temesvar on August 10, 1849. Three days later Görgei, to whom Kossuth had resigned the dictatorship, surrendered with all his forces to the Russians at Villagos.

Exasperated by the consciousness that they had been rescued from defeat only by the intervention of Russia, the Austrians inflicted terrible atrocities upon the vanquished. Bem, Kossuth, and other leaders, with about 5000 Hungarians, escaped to Turkey, where they found generous protection. The Sultan, although threatened with war by Russia and Austria, refused to surrender the refugees. Hungary was crushed. Its political existence, for a time at least, seemed annihilated.

**Return to Absolutism in Austria.**—A Constitutional Assembly had met on July 22, 1848. In the polyglot body eight nationalities were represented. It was a burning question as to which language should be declared official. The deputies sat like enemies in as many hostile

groups. Every theory found fierce expression. Order and even decency of debate were impossible. Nevertheless, at their request the emperor returned to the capital. In a street riot Latour, the minister of war, was stripped naked and hanged to a lamp-post. The timorous emperor fled to Olmütz, thinking he would find his most trusty protectors among the Slavs. But he left a manifesto behind, wherein he declared that he would take such measures as he thought best to repress anarchy and preserve liberty. An imperial rescript suspended the sessions of the Assembly, although authorizing them to meet some weeks later at the Moravian town of Kremsier. Only a meager fraction availed themselves of the permission. Meanwhile Schwartzenberg was appointed to the Cabinet, inasmuch as he knew "how to put down revolutions." Yet the ministry made a general declaration in favor of constitutional liberty. Their most difficult task was to find an equilibrium between the various Austrian states and to regulate the relations of the whole with Germany, of which the Austrian Empire constituted a part. Yet by March 4, 1849, an anomalous and impracticable constitution had been devised. In the universal discontent it was never put into execution. So Schwartzenberg could well declare that it was only "a basis on which to reëstablish the authority of the throne." On January 1, 1852, this figment of a charter was definitely suppressed. Nothing had been gained except a slight improvement in the condition of the peasants.

**Defeat and Abdication of Charles Albert.**—The king of Piedmont had staked his crown upon the issue of war. He dreamed of a reunited Italy under the leadership of his house. But provincial jealousies chilled enthusiasm and hampered unity of action. Each insurgent state concerned itself with its own interests and failed to realize that victory was possible only through concerted effort. The king was a royalist, suspicious of republicanism and of any popular movement. He even disdained the volunteers who were ready to flock to his standard. Nevertheless many of those volunteer bands were to show surprising military qualities when pitted against the

veterans of the enemy. Radetzki was one of the few able generals whom Austria has produced. Though over eighty years of age, he was a most formidable antagonist.

On June 24, 1848, the decisive battle was fought at Custozza. The defeated Piedmontese withdrew to Milan, where bitter quarrels broke out between them and the Milanese. The king surrendered the city and afterwards signed an armistice, agreeing to take no farther part in the war. He had hitherto refused the conditional assistance of the French. Now, when he implored it without conditions, it was too late.

Custozza had really decided the fate of Italy. Her chief soldier withdrawn from the conflict, the submission of the peninsula to the old system was henceforth only a question of time. But the patriots held out with surprising tenacity and with even increasing vigor. Both at Florence and Rome democratic republics were proclaimed and constitutional assemblies convoked. A new wave of resolution swept over the land. But the political question had become complicated with the ecclesiastical question. Cardinal Antonelli asked for the interference of the four Catholic Powers, Austria, France, Spain, and Naples, in behalf of the Pope. Austria was ready to act, but Louis Napoleon dispatched 7000 men to Rome, though the object of the expedition was not at first clear. Ferdinand of Naples had reduced Sicily and was trampling on his promises of reform. Bombardment of his Sicilian cities had given him the nickname of "King Bomba," which the subsequent atrocities of his reign were to render odious.

In Piedmont the vociferous populace and the parliament demanded that Charles Albert should again attack Austria, inasmuch as she was apparently the only foreign state which the Italian cause had to dread. The king yielded. But he counted on no assistance from Rome or Florence and he knew that his own army was disinclined to the war. He entered upon the campaign rather as a martyr than as a soldier. It was disastrous. Despite the heroism of his troops, he met a crushing defeat at Novara. On the evening after the battle the un-

happy sovereign abdicated the throne in favor of his son, Victor Emmanuel.

The heart of revolution was now at Rome. Mazzini, like a modern Rienzi, and the impetuous Garibaldi inflamed the resolution of the people not to submit. But it was the French under General Oudinot and not the Austrians who attacked and then invested the city. After a siege, lasting twenty-nine days, despite prodigies of valor on the part of the besieged, the capital was taken and the Roman republic overthrown by the soldiers of republican France (June 29, 1849).

The catastrophe of Novara and the fall of Rome could not shake the courage of Venice. Nowhere was the Austrian rule more abhorred, yet nowhere were fewer crimes and excesses committed in the effort to shake it off. Her resistance lasted seventeen months. During 146 days she experienced all the horrors of siege and bombardment. She succumbed only to the exhaustion caused by famine and cholera. To Venice and to her illustrious dictator, Manin, attaches purer glory than to any other Italian state or leader in the agony of the struggle. On August 28, 1849, the triumphant Austrian flag floated once more over the Piazza of Saint Mark. The former rulers and the old ways were restored throughout Italy.

**Conservatism of Pius IX.**—On his accession he had shown sympathy with constitutional liberty. But he dreaded the excesses of the democracy. Desirous of reform, he wished it to come gently and gradually. The frenzied passion of Mazzini appalled him even more than did the iron rule of Radetzki. Though a temporal prince, he shrank from military action because head of the Church. So he refused to yield to popular clamor and declare war against Austria. But in September, 1848, he called Count Rossi to preside over the Papal Cabinet, and thus indicated his fixed purpose to pursue a policy of moderate liberalism.

Two months later this capable and patriotic minister was stabbed by an anarchist on the very day when he was to open the session of the Chambers with a speech, promising to abolish the rule of the cardinals, to insti-

tute a lay government, and to insist upon the emancipation and unification of Italy. A radical mob attacked the papal palace. The Pope, in disguise, escaped to Gaeta. When the Roman republic was proclaimed his temporal power was abolished. Not till 1850 did he return to his capital. No longer did he manifest any inclination toward reform. No triumph of reaction anywhere was more to be deplored than that which it had gained over the mind of the sovereign pontiff.

**Dissolution of the General Assembly at Frankfort.**— Despite the patriotism and learning of its members, it is a melancholy fact that the Assembly was doomed to failure from the start. It had been elected to draw up a constitution for all Germany, but the degree of its authority was a disputed point and it possessed no means of enforcing its decrees. It could only discuss and recommend. There was not in Germany a race problem as in Austria, and on the part of the German peoples there was a common desire for union. But the country was still too torn by violent and determined factions and too distracted by the selfish aims of the different states to secure common and voluntary acceptance of the salutary measures which might be proposed. Furthermore the deputies were not practical men but theorists without tact or political experience.

For a time, however, its measures commanded respect. Thus, when it decided to replace the Diet by a central executive and elected Archduke John of Austria as administrator of Germany, the archduke accepted the office and the Diet resigned its authority into his hands. But when the troops of the confederation were ordered to swear fidelity to this administrator, Austria and Prussia ignored the order, and it was obeyed only in the smaller states.

At the same time, at Berlin, the Prussian national Assembly was holding stormy and fruitless sessions and the city itself was for months in a condition little better than anarchy. Tired of oratory and street turmoil, the Prussians were not displeased when royal decrees placed their capital under martial law and dissolved their Assembly. This failure of the Prussian Assembly at Berlin

had an injurious effect upon the General Assembly at Frankfort.

Nevertheless, it patched together a constitution for the whole empire and elected as emperor Frederick William IV, the king of Prussia. The constitution was at once rejected by Austria, Bavaria, Saxony, and Hanover, and Frederick William in a guarded manner declined the crown. The Assembly daily dwindled away until less than a hundred delegates remained. It was removed to Stuttgart on May 30, 1849, and was finally dispersed by the police. Nothing had been gained. All things continued as they were before.

## THE SECOND FRENCH EMPIRE

**The Plebiscites of 1851 and 1852.**—A French plebiscite is an expression by universal suffrage wherein only "yes" or "no" is answered to a question submitted for decision. The constitution proposed December, 1851, was accepted and the presidential power for ten years conferred on Louis Napoleon by a plebiscite of 7,437,216 "yes" and 640,737 "no."

The decennial presidency heralded the empire. A year later the Senate asked for a plebiscite on the proposition that the empire should be restored in the person of Louis Napoleon and of his descendants. The affirmative vote was 8,157,752, the negative 254,501. So the empire was solemnly proclaimed on December 2, 1852, the anniversary of the coronation of the first Napoleon. The crowned president was speedily recognized as Napoleon III by all the courts of Europe. In the following January he married a Spanish lady of Scottish ancestry, Eugénie de Montijo, Countess of Teba.

Worn out by the turmoils of the preceding years, indignant at the secondary rôle she had filled in Europe since 1815, France desired a strong government which would insure tranquillity at home, and hence restore credit and develop material prosperity while at the same time making her respected abroad. There can be no doubt

that the vast majority of the people were content to leave in the hands of the new "Emperor of the French" a power hardly inferior to that exercised by a sultan or shah. The constitution centralized all authority in the person of its elected chief. He alone could command the army, direct public policy, decide upon war, and conclude peace. The ministers, appointed by him, were responsible only to him. They were rather his secretaries or functionaries than a cabinet. The legislative body, elected for six years, voted upon the taxes and the laws submitted to it by the Council of State, but could of its own initiative propose nothing. The Senate consisted of 150 members, who were appointed for life by the emperor. It revised the laws voted by the legislative body and could accept or reject them as it deemed best. The Council of State was likewise named by the sovereign.

**The Crimean War** (1853-1856).—A famous apothegm of Napoleon III, "The empire is peace," was to be refuted by events in Eastern Europe. Since the days of Francis I and Suleïman the Magnificent, France had been the traditional ally of the Ottoman Empire. Sometimes, as under Napoleon I, such relations had been interrupted, but the sentiment none the less existed. Furthermore, France was recognized by the Ottomans as the protectress of Latin Christians in the East. So, when troubles broke out in 1853 between Russia and Turkey,—nominally over a monkish question as to the guardianship of certain holy places in Jerusalem and as to the claim of the Tsar to exercise protection over the Orthodox Greek subjects of the Sultan,—Napoleon found a felicitous occasion to draw the sword.

Great Britain was above all other states interested in the maintenance of the Ottoman Empire. The sovereign of the French, though officially recognized, was everywhere regarded as an imperial parvenu. An alliance between him and Queen Victoria, granddaughter of George III,—the only sovereign in Europe who had persistently refused to acknowledge Napoleon I as emperor,—would dazzle the French and add a peculiar splendor to his crown. His overtures were well received. When the Ottoman fleet in the bay of Sinope was destroyed

by the Russians (November 30, 1853), the French and British squadrons entered the Black Sea. A few months later, France and Great Britain signed a treaty with Turkey and formed an offensive and defensive alliance with each other.

Prussia, though inactive, sympathized with Russia. Austria hesitated, remembering that her endangered political existence had been preserved by Russia in 1849, and yet not unwilling that the overshadowing Muscovite Empire should receive a check. Without allying herself with the western Powers, she demanded that the Russians should evacuate the Danubian principalities which they had occupied.

Cronstadt on the Baltic was the key to St. Petersburg. Failing in attack upon this fortress, which the British admiral in command, Sir Charles Napier, declared was impregnable, the allies resolved to concentrate their efforts in an invasion of Russia from the south. Odessa had been successfully bombarded in April.

A French army under Marshal St. Arnaud and an English army under Lord Raglan landed at Gallipoli on the Dardanelles. The Russians, who were, furthermore, threatened on the west by the Austrians, evacuated the principalities and recrossed the Pruth. Austria at once occupied the abandoned provinces, promising to restore them to the Sultan on the conclusion of peace.

It was decided to attack Sebastopol, the great arsenal of Russia in the Crimea and the military center from which she threatened the south. The city was at that time utterly unprepared to withstand a siege. On September 24 a fleet of 500 ships disembarked 30,000 French, 27,000 British, and 7000 Turks at Eupatoria, thirty miles to the north.

The operations against the beleaguered city went on under various forms for 351 days. The Russian generals, Mentshikoff, Todleben, and Korniloff, strengthened the defenses and resisted with Russian obstinacy. The battles of Alma, Balaklava, and Inkerman were favorable, on the whole, to the allies. Meanwhile St. Arnaud died and was succeeded by Marshal Canrobert, who, exhausted, gave way to General Pélissier. Lord Raglan

died and was replaced by General James Simpson. The soldiers, especially the British, who were insufficiently supplied, suffered horribly in a winter of unusual vigor. In a single storm twenty-one transports were wrecked. Piedmont, glad to make its existence remembered, sent to the assistance of the allies a little army of 18,000 well-equipped men. Together with the French they won the battle of Tchernaya (August 16), the decisive action of the campaign. By September 8 everything was ready for the final assault. The two chief defenses of the city were the Malakoff and the Great Redan. The French successfully stormed the former, but the British, despite their desperate courage, were unable to capture the latter. However, the Malakoff taken, further resistance was useless, and the Russian army withdrew.

In Asia the Russian arms had been successful and they had captured the stronghold of Kars, which commanded the eastern approaches to Asia Minor.

Sebastopol was in the hands of the conquerors. To make themselves masters of it, the allies had sacrificed the lives of more than 100,000 of their troops. Russia's losses were even greater. Nevertheless, the utmost efforts of four Powers, assisted by the military interference of Austria, had only sufficed to reduce a fortress on the extreme southern verge of her empire. Her frontier had been touched but she had not been really invaded. The Tsar Nicholas I had died on March 2, 1855, and been succeeded by the milder and less persistent Alexander II.

The treaty was signed at Paris on March 30, 1856. It neutralized the Black Sea, guaranteed liberty of navigation in the Danube, from which it removed Russia by a slight rectification of her western frontier, and abolished the protectorate of Russia over the Danubian provinces and over her coreligionists in Turkey. Turkey was admitted to the international concert of states, and the Hatti Sherif of the Sultan, promising religious privileges to his non-Mussulman subjects, was incorporated in the treaty as a contract between him and Europe.

However gravely accepted and proclaimed, most of these conditions could be regarded only in the light of

temporary accommodation. The really important achievement of the congress was its enunciation of the four following principles in international law: privateering is abolished; the neutral flag covers an enemy's goods, except contraband of war; neutral goods, except contraband of war, are exempt from capture even under an enemy's flag; a blockade to be respected must be effectual.

It was a splendid triumph for the French emperor and for France when the congress assembled at Paris to determine the conditions of peace. In the eyes of his people Napoleon III appeared to be the arbiter of the continent. The distant campaign had been attended with frightful loss in money and men, but it was forgotten in such glory as had not attended the French arms since the first Napoleon invaded Russia.

**War with Austria** (1859).—Piedmont, the only independent and constitutional Italian state, had won the gratitude of France and of Great Britain by her coöperation in the Crimean War. Her prime minister, Count Cavour, had taken part in the Congress of Paris and had dexterously improved the occasion to denounce the misgovernment of central and southern Italy and to arraign the Austrian occupation of Lombardy and Venice. Thereby he thrust the Italian question to the forefront of Europe. In 1858 he made a secret treaty with Napoleon, the object of which was the expulsion of Austria from the peninsula, and in January, 1859, cemented the relations of France and Piedmont by the marriage of Prince Napoleon, cousin of the emperor, to the Princess Clotilda, daughter of Victor Emmanuel.

While all Europe was considering a proposition from the British court for general disarmament, Austria committed a political blunder disastrous to herself. She addressed a note to the Piedmontese court, demanding the disarmament of their troops in the space of three days. Cavour gave a diplomatic reply, though gross provocation had come from Austria. Six days later she crossed the Ticino, this act being equivalent to a declaration of war against not only Piedmont but France. Napoleon wished to win for himself some of the military laurels

his generals had gained in the Crimea, and took command in person. In his progress southward through France he was hailed with tremendous enthusiasm by the citizens, who rejoiced that their armies were again to fight the battles of Italian liberty.

The campaign was short but eventful. A main factor in determining the result was the proverbial slowness and indecision of the Austrian generals. General Forey with inferior forces defeated the enemy at Montebello (May 20). Marshal MacMahon gained a battle at Magenta (June 2), where the Austrians lost 20,000 killed and wounded and 7000 prisoners. The victors entered Milan amid a delirium of joy. Abandoning Lombardy, the Austrians concentrated 160,000 troops for a decisive action at Solferino. The French and Piedmontese forces were almost as numerous. The two emperors were in command. After a ten hours' battle the Austrians were compelled to retreat, leaving 30,000 men upon the field (June 24). Napoleon slept that night in the chamber which his imperial antagonist had occupied in the morning.

Napoleon had declared that he would free Italy from the Alps to the Adriatic. But his position was one of extreme peril. The famous " quadrilateral " was still held by the enemy. Numerous reënforcements were pouring into the Austrian camp. Prussia and the southwestern German states, dismayed at the progress of revolutionary ideas and unwilling to see France too victorious, showed a disposition to take part in the war. A proposition for an interview was made to Francis Joseph, and at Villafranca the two sovereigns signed the preliminaries of peace, afterwards confirmed by the Treaty of Zurich. Lombardy was annexed to Piedmont. The sovereigns of Tuscany and Modena were to return to their states, but no foreign armies were to aid them in securing repossession. An Italian federation was to be formed under the presidency of the Pope. Piedmont skillfully kept herself free from entangling promises as to the future of Italy. Savoy and Nice, after a plebiscite of their inhabitants, expressing the desire therefor, were annexed to France.

**Material Progress** (1852-1867).—These years are marked by brilliant prosperity. Under a strong and presumably stable government the people were no longer disturbed by fear of revolution and devoted themselves with ardor to every branch of activity. Private and public enterprise covered France with a network of railroads. Highways were laid out and bridges constructed in all directions. Easier and cheaper means of communication were both a cause and result of wonderful development in manufactures and trade. Sagacious commercial treaties with Great Britain, Italy, Belgium, and other states favored the export of French products and introduced foreign products at cheaper rates. In thirteen years the exports and imports trebled in value.

Popular education developed as never before in France. The pupils increased by 1,000,000 in fifteen years. Special attention was paid to professional, industrial, and technical schools. The law of April 10, 1867, specifically provided for the education of girls. An immense number of school libraries were founded. Instruction seemed an antidote for crime. "According as the schools filled up the prisons emptied."

Paris, congested in narrow and crooked streets, was rebuilt on a magnificent scale by Baron Haussmann, prefect of the Seine. Even the Louvre, hitherto unfinished, was completed. Lyons and Marseilles were almost transformed. The same thing went on upon a proportional scale in the other cities and towns. Public gardens and parks were created for the diversion and health of the people. Sanitary measures diminished the death-rate. A sense of well-being and comfort pervaded the country.

**The Universal Exposition of 1867.**—This was the visible expression of all the material prosperity under the empire. It may be called also the culmination of its glory.

The Champ de Mars was converted into a city of exhibition, or a world bazaar. From all over the globe manufacturers, inventors, agriculturists, artists, merchants flocked to Paris to there exhibit and behold all the achievements of peace and to vie with one another in

the display of their various products. It was a tournament of all mankind, where international juries awarded prizes for the best things which the human hand and brain had done. No equal international exhibition had ever been held. It surpassed every other in the number, variety, and excellence of the articles displayed, and these articles represented every department of human science and activity.

Inevitably, because held in France and other nations were more or less remote, the French exhibit was superior to the rest. The French might take a legitimate pride, not only in the fact that the marvelous exhibition was devised by them, but in the preëminent splendor of their share in the exhibit. Napoleon and France occupied the proud position of hosts. The most enlightened foreigners by tens and hundreds of thousands thronged their capital as guests. The emperors of Russia and Austria, the queen of Great Britain, the kings of Italy, Prussia, Belgium, Sweden, and Denmark, the Sultan of the Ottoman Empire, and numerous other rulers of civilized or barbarous states by their presence added to the dignity and enhanced the magnificence of the occasion. Paris for half a year was decked as in a perpetual fête.

**Humiliations of the Empire.**—Two were of such a nature as to be peculiarly galling to a sensitive people. The first and most important was administered by the United States. In 1862 France, Great Britain, and Spain sent a joint military expedition to Mexico to enforce the payment of certain claims. When their ostensible object was attained Great Britain and Spain withdrew. The United States were then engaged in a civil war, which Napoleon believed would end in the dissolution of the Union. Therefore he judged the occasion favorable to set up a Latin empire, which should counterpoise any Anglo-Saxon republics in the Western world. The Archduke Maximilian, brother of the emperor of Austria, consented to accept the crown to be wrung for him from Mexico, Napoleon promising to maintain an army of 25,000 French soldiers for the protection of the new emperor. The American government had refused to rec-

ognize any authority in Mexico except that of the dispossessed president, Juarez, but, its hands tied by the civil war, was unable to do more. After the Confederacy was overthrown, it notified Napoleon that his soldiers must be withdrawn. The French emperor judged it expedient to comply, though in so doing he violated his promise to Maximilian and ignominiously left him to destruction. Meanwhile Carlotta, the devoted wife of Maximilian, journeyed from court to court in Europe, entreating assistance for her husband and denouncing the desertion of him by Napoleon. Successive disappointments overthrew her reason. The Mexican Empire was destroyed by Juarez, and Maximilian was finally captured and shot as a usurper (June 19, 1867). The news of the terrible disaster reached Europe while Paris was in the full tide of the Universal Exposition and cast a gloom upon the gayety and brilliancy of the occasion. The French Empire never recovered from the shock of this Mexican failure.

The second humiliation was the work of Count von Bismarck, president of the Prussian Cabinet. In the Prusso-Austrian war of 1866 it was of supreme importance to the Prussians to prevent the interference of France, whose sympathies lay with Austria. So Bismarck gave Napoleon to understand that in case Prussia was victorious and increased her territory, France should receive an equivalent by the annexation of Luxemburg on her northeastern frontier. The war ended in the aggrandizement of Prussia. Thereupon Napoleon demanded the cession of Luxemburg, but Bismarck now informed him that the Germans were opposed to any such arrangement, and that hence it was impossible. Napoleon had thus been ridiculously outwitted in the face of all Europe. But France was utterly unprepared for war and could only submit to the blow dealt her own and her emperor's prestige.

The third humiliation of the empire was inflicted upon it by the people in the plebiscite of May 8, 1870. By various modifications, introduced voluntarily by the sovereign, the government had passed from the absolute autocracy of 1852 to the constitutional or parliamentary

monarchy of 1870. Political exiles had been amnestied and made eligible to office. Gradually concessions, although not extorted, had been granted until the country enjoyed freedom of the press, of parliamentary criticism and debate, responsibility of the ministers to the Chamber, and a constitution revised in a liberal sense. By the latter, granted April 20, 1870, the legislative power was shared by the Senate and the Chamber, while all power to further change the constitution was intrusted to the people. Upon the advice of his minister, M. Rouher, the emperor asked a plebiscite concerning the reforms successively introduced and the revised constitution. An affirmative vote was furthermore understood to mean attachment to the reigning dynasty. Though there were only 1,500,000 nays to over 7,000,000 yeas, the negative vote was surprisingly large and also alarming in what it represented. While the rural districts were to all intents unanimous, an immense dissatisfaction with the state of things was revealed by the vote of Paris, the larger cities, and the army. Moreover, many of its adherents were indignant at the recent course of the government in dispatching French troops to put down Garibaldi and in declaring its intention to maintain by arms the temporal power of the Pope. The plebiscite, despite the immense majority of 5,500,000, was considered a rebuff.

**The Franco-Prussian War** (1870-1871).—An increasing exasperation of the French against the Prussians and a growing animosity between the two states had existed ever since the Prusso-Austrian war. An ultimate conflict was inevitable. Events concurred to hasten the catastrophe.

The Spaniards, who had expelled their Bourbon dynasty, offered the Spanish crown to Prince Leopold of Hohenzollern, a near kinsman of William I, king of Prussia. All France was on fire with excitement. Nor was the agitation allayed when it was heard that the prince had declined the offer. The foreign minister, the Duke de Grammont, the Empress Eugénie, the Chamber, and the populace of Paris did their utmost to fan the flames. Napoleon and the calmer heads, like Thiers, were

averse to war. But the emperor, exhausted by the ravages of an incurable malady, was no longer the cool, firm man who had executed the coup d'état or commanded at Solferino. The Duke de Grammont asserted, "We are ready, more than ready," and the prime minister, Ollivier, announced, "We accept the responsibility with a light heart!" War was declared by France on July 15, 1870. Never was a war a more rapid succession of disasters.

Prussia, under William I, Von Moltke, minister of war, and Bismarck, had for years been steadily preparing for the struggle which she knew was to come. No nation was ever more terribly ready. Not a shoe-latchet was wanting to the troops. Treaties assured her the active support of all Germany. Even the plans of campaign were all matured. France had not an ally on whom to depend. Her regiments were incomplete, ill provisioned, and ill armed. Yet, intoxicated with rage and overweening confidence in herself, she threw herself into the conflict as a gambler risks his all upon a throw.

The French armies were mobilized with distressing slowness. Twenty days after the declaration of war the hostile forces had invaded France. The crown prince of Prussia defeated General Douay at Weissenburg (August 4), and, two days later, with 100,000 men destroyed an army of 45,000 men under Marshal MacMahon at Wörth. Then, as all through the war, the French fought with desperate courage and determination. But heroism without plan and with inferior arms was of no avail against equal heroism attended by superior numbers and skill. The battle of Wörth was decisive of the campaign. By the victory the Prusso-German forces projected into France like a mighty wedge, and afterwards the French main armies, pressed to the right and left, could never unite. Moreover, Austria and Italy, who might have assisted France, were disinclined to join their fortunes to a lost cause. Skillful maneuvers and the victories of Forbach and Gravelotte succeeded in hemming the commander-in-chief, Marshal Bazaine, with 173,000 men, inside the fortifications of Metz. There he was at once besieged by the crown prince of Saxony.

**Sedan.**—A forlorn hope remained for the deliverance of Bazaine. Marshal MacMahon, the ablest general of France, with 130,000 troops marched to his relief. But he was hampered by the presence of the emperor, who had left the Empress Eugénie as regent, and by the constant interference of the French minister of war, Count Palikao. While in the valley of Sedan his army was surrounded by 250,000 Germans, who, by forced marches and in perfect obedience to concerted plans, had closed in upon them. Retreat or advance was impossible. After three days of hopeless fight and terrible loss, the French surrendered, Napoleon himself offering his sword to King William. Together with the emperor 104,000 men had been taken prisoners.

**Fall of the Empire** (September 4, 1870).—The news of the surrender was received at Paris with frenzy. The mob took control, pronounced the deposition of the emperor, and proclaimed the republic. On the pillars of the Palace Bourbon they chalked the names of those whom they wished to direct affairs and who, without further election, assumed authority as the Government of National Defense. General Trochu was made president, Jules Favre, minister of foreign affairs, Gambetta, minister of the interior, Jules Simon, minister of public instruction, and General Le Flô, minister of war. Their attempts to place the responsibility for the war upon Napoleon were coldly received by the Germans, who furthermore showed unwillingness to treat with an irresponsible government. M. Thiers was sent to London, St. Petersburg, Vienna, and Florence to beg assistance, but everywhere in vain. Jules Favre declared that France would not yield an inch of her soil, and the Germans had resolved to consider no propositions of peace that did not include the acquisition of Alsace and Lorraine.

**Surrender of Metz** (October 27).—Completely shut in, Marshal Bazaine received only such news of the condition of France as the enemy judged expedient. Cut off from all hope of rescue, his cavalry and artillery horses killed for food, his provisions exhausted, he surrendered. His army of 173,000 men were sent to Germany to share

the captivity of the prisoners of Sedan. A capitulation on such an enormous scale was unexampled. No event in the war has been more bitterly criticised and its necessity more angrily disputed. After the cessation of hostilities Bazaine was tried by a court-martial and condemned to death.

In spite of obstinate resistance, Toul (September 23), Strasburg (September 28), Verdun (November 8), and all the fortified places of northwestern France, except Belfort, were one after the other forced to capitulate.

**Siege and Surrender of Paris** (January 28, 1871).—The siege of Paris began on September 19. Gambetta escaped in a balloon (passing over the German lines), and reaching Toul, became a virtual dictator. Infusing his own wild energy into the people of central and southern France, he induced them to prolong a hopeless struggle. Yet each day's added resistance could only increase the general suffering and force harsher terms upon France in the end. Meanwhile, the Germans, leaving sufficient forces for the siege of Paris, deluged the country on the west and south. The untrained French levies under Generals Aurelle de Paladines and Bourbaki could only delay but not prevent their advance.

Paris held out for 142 days. The city, always regarded as frivolous, showed such sternness and tenacity in defense as no other great capital has ever equaled. Each desperate sortie drew the iron bands tighter around her, and she yielded at last, not to the Germans, but to famine. The German Empire had been proclaimed in the Palace of Versailles ten days before. Even then Gambetta was unwilling to give up, and resigned his office only when he had been disavowed by the government of Paris.

**The Treaty of Frankfort.**—In the hour of her extremest distress France turned to her one statesman, Thiers. He could not save her, but he might somewhat alleviate the miseries of her fall. The National Assembly, elected by German consent, met at Bordeaux. The Government of National Defense laid down its powers. Thiers was appointed to form a ministry and negotiate terms of peace. With Count Bismarck he wrestled over each

point in the Prussian demands. Hard though the terms imposed, they would have been still harder but for him. It was agreed that France should pay $1,000,000,000 indemnity in the space of three years, and that all Alsace except Belfort, and one-fifth of Lorraine including Metz, should be annexed to Germany. The evacuation of territory was to take place proportionally as the indemnity was paid.

This preliminary treaty was approved by the French Assembly on March 2 and formally ratified at Frankfort on May 10, 1871.

## GERMANY

### (1848-1871)

**Rivalry of Prussia and Austria.**—Of the thirty-eight sovereignties which composed the German Confederation, Austria and Prussia were by far the most important. Both were disliked by the other German states, but Austria, although the larger and stronger, was dreaded less than Prussia. During the preceding 150 years they had gradually approached each other by an inverse process, the one by intermittent development and expansion, the other by intermittent decline, until they stood almost upon a par. Liberty had nothing to hope from the government of either. Nor could it be expected that either would advance the cause of German union except by making other and weaker states dependent upon itself. Prussia, because of her more restricted territory and smaller population, caused less anxiety to Europe than did Austria, who, because an agglomeration of races, never could rally the Germans to the cry of nationality.

The problem what to do with Austria had disturbed the wordy National Assembly at Frankfort in 1848 and 1849. Some of the delegates proposed that she should remain a state apart, either abandoning her German provinces or retaining them, but in any case to be reckoned outside of Germany. Other delegates proposed that all the German states and all the Austrian provinces of

whatever race should combine in one enormous empire, spanning Europe from the Baltic to the Adriatic, and that Austria should be its head. The first of these propositions may be called the Prussian, and the second proposition the Austrian plan. This crucial question received its solution only eighteen years afterward, and meanwhile affected the whole current of German politics.

**Question of Schleswig-Holstein** (1848-1855).—Schleswig and Holstein are two duchies lying between Denmark and Germany. The inhabitants of the former were mainly, and of the latter exclusively, German. Both enjoyed a separate political existence, with their own customs and laws, although their sovereign was the king of Denmark. Frederick VII at his accession incorporated Schleswig with his Danish states. But the German Diet as formally incorporated Schleswig with Germany and appointed Prussia by the sword to carry this action into effect. The Danes gained the advantage in battle. A protocol, signed at London in 1850 by Great Britain, France, Austria, Russia, Sweden, and Denmark, and another treaty in 1852, introduced diplomatic arrangements which decided little, contented no one, but contained the germ of future trouble.

The king went on with his attempted Danification of the duchies. In 1855 he published a constitution wherein the same laws were applied indiscriminately to them and to all his other provinces. The duchies protested, Germany threatened to interfere, and Frederick granted certain concessions. The general irritation did not diminish. Relying on the promise of Great Britain to protect the integrity of Danish territory, and swept along by the enthusiasm of the Danes, the king persisted in measures that were both impolitic and unjust. In 1863 by a manifesto he assimilated Schleswig to his other possessions and declared that Holstein should pay certain taxes, which had not been voted by her Estates. After fruitless negotiations the German Diet determined on armed intervention and occupied Holstein by Saxon and Hanoverian troops (December, 1863). The Danish forces withdrew without resistance into Schleswig. Thus

far the contention had been one of race. The Danes had determined to blot out the German character of the duchies, which the inhabitants of those duchies were as determined to retain.

**King William I and Otto von Bismarck.**—On January 2, 1861, William I ascended the Prussian throne. His brother, Frederick William IV, suffering from insanity, he had acted as regent during the preceding two years. He was a man of strong character and decided opinions, fully persuaded of the divine right of kings. His despotic sentiments often brought him into collision with the people, and he was by no means popular. A soldier from his birth, he believed the welfare of Prussia was bound up in the army.

Though otherwise evincing no extraordinary talents, he showed remarkable sagacity in the choice of men for important positions. Then he honored them with his full confidence, and, absolute as he was, allowed them wide latitude in carrying out his ideas. In the autumn after his accession he appointed Otto von Bismarck Minister of Foreign Affairs and President of the Cabinet. No other choice could have been equally felicitous. If the renown of the minister afterwards overshadowed that of the master, it was largely gained by the fidelity as well as the wonderful ability of his services. From 1862 to 1870 the biography of Bismarck is the history of Prussia; from 1870 to 1890 his biography is the history of Germany. In an epoch-making age he stands without a peer among the statesmen of continental Europe.

A conflict was pending in 1862 between the king and the Prussian parliament over the bill reorganizing the army. The scheme proposed more than doubled the numbers of its troops while vastly increasing their efficiency. But the people saw in the project only an additional weapon of despotism. The lower Chamber loaded the bill with amendments and finally rejected it altogether. Bismarck had no respect for popular votes or parliamentary majorities. Already he had declared that the great questions of the time were to be settled "by blood and iron." He advised the king to prorogue

the Chambers, silence the press, and reorganize the army as he pleased. His advice was followed.

The military system of Prussia, which was to defeat Austria, crush France, and reunite Germany, was the result. But it was founded none the less on a royal usurpation of legislative rights.

**Austro-Prussian Occupation of Schleswig-Holstein** (1863-1864).—The troubles in the duchies afforded Bismarck an admirable opportunity. First he strenuously persuaded Austria to join Prussia and interfere, regardless of the Diet and of the wishes of the other German states. After sending an ultimatum to Copenhagen, which was rejected, the Prussian and Austrian forces invaded Denmark, not as the armed agents of Germany or in behalf of the duchies, but solely on their own account. The little nation was helpless against their attack. Neither did she receive the promised aid of Great Britain. By the Treaty of Vienna (October 30, 1864) Christian IX was obliged to cede all the disputed territory to Prussia and Austria jointly. The odium of the conquest fell equally on the two Powers, but the gains were to be reaped only by Prussia. By the Convention of Gastein—one of the most brilliant diplomatic triumphs Bismarck ever won—to her was assigned Schleswig with the seaport of Kiel in Holstein. Austria was to retain Holstein, a distant acquisition, which could only be to her a source of weakness and a cause of future trouble.

**Seven Weeks' War between Prussia and Austria** (1866).—Prussia was at last ready for the final struggle against her adversary. Her army was fully disciplined and equipped. Great Britain, France, and Russia endeavored to mediate and prevent the war, but to no purpose. Most of the German states sided with Austria. On June 15 Prussia declared war against Hanover, Hesse, and Saxony. On the 20th Italy, whose offensive and defensive alliance had been gained by the promise of Venetia, declared war against Austria and Bavaria. Meanwhile Prussia had 500,000 men under arms. She struck with astounding rapidity, but Austria and her allies moved as in sleep or stupor. Within a week Hanover, Hesse, and Saxony were subdued, their armies captured

or destroyed, and their kings in flight. Into Bohemia, whose passes were undefended, poured 280,000 men with 800 guns. Marshal Benedek had no more than 210,000 men and 762 guns of inferior caliber with which to oppose them. In two days' time he lost a sixth of his army and sent word to the Austrian emperor that his only hope was in peace. The reply was an order to give battle, and the order was obeyed.

**Sadowa** (July 3, 1866).—Benedek chose a strong position at Sadowa in an amphitheater of wooded hills in front of Königgrätz, the Elbe being in his rear. With the precision of a machine his foes in three several armies under King William, Count von Moltke, the Minister of War, the Crown Prince, General von Roon, General Hiller, Prince Frederick Charles, and other of the ablest commanders in Europe were marching upon him. Even Bismarck was there to rejoice in the ruin for which he had prepared the way and to conduct the negotiations after the already certain victory.

The Prussians began their attack at three o'clock in the morning. The Crown Prince of Prussia with his army was to reach his position on the extreme Austrian right ten hours later. The Austrians held their ground with unflinching courage, but mere gallantry is a minor element in modern warfare. Even the fog fought for the Prussians and masked the movements of the Crown Prince until his army assailed and destroyed the Austrian right. Driven from their lines by the always mounting tide of the attack, the soldiers of Benedek at last gave way and in one enormous broken mass rushed toward the river. That day's fighting cost Austria 4190 killed, 11,900 wounded, 20,000 prisoners, and 160 cannon. Above all, it hurled her out of Germany and crowned Prussia, her hereditary foe, with the leadership over the Germans.

It is common to ascribe the victory at Sadowa to the Prussian needle-gun, which, though carrying a shorter distance, could be fired five times as fast as the Austrian rifle and with far deadlier effect. The superiority of this weapon, however, was but one among the many factors that ensured Prussian success.

The road to Vienna was open. There was no army to oppose the advance of the invaders. After ineffectual attempts at negotiation, Austria implored the mediation of Napoleon to secure peace, thereby abandoning her as yet unconquered and unattacked allies, Bavaria, Baden, Würtemberg, Hesse, and other south German states. They were subdued with celerity.

Meanwhile, Austrian dynastic pride was soothed by the victory of the Archduke Albert over the Italians at Custozza (June 24), an ill-omened field for Italy, and by the destruction of the Italian navy at Lissa (July 20) by Admiral Tegetthoff.

**Hegemony of Prussia** (1866-1871).—The conditions of peace were, as always, hard for the vanquished. Austria recognized her exclusion from Germany, abandoned her claims to Schleswig and Holstein, ceded Venetia to Italy, agreed to pay an indemnity of 20,000,000 thalers, and left Prussia free to organize Germany as she pleased.

Prussia, despite the protests of Great Britain, added to her territory Hanover, the electorate of Hesse, Nassau, the free city of Frankfort, Schleswig-Holstein, and certain smaller territories, to facilitate her internal communications. Upon the states of southern Germany, Bavaria, Würtemberg, and Baden, she imposed treaties of offensive and defensive alliance, and was also guaranteed the command of their armies in case of war. These treaties, however, were to be kept profoundly secret.

The most manifest and imposing monument of Sadowa was the North German Confederation, of which the king of Prussia was president. It comprised Prussia and in general all the states north of the river Main. Though a federal parliament, the Reichstag, was created, each state retained its own chambers and local laws. A federal council, wherein out of forty-three votes Prussia had seventeen, regulated federal relations. Even the reluctant southern kingdoms were shrewdly interested in the new order, being requested to send delegates who, together with the members of the Reichstag, should decide the customs-dues and the tariff regulations of all Germany. The North German Confederation was the

sure prophecy of the speedy German unification under a German Empire.

The colors of Prussia were black and white. The new national standard in its union of black, white, and red proclaimed her hegemony.

**Unification of Germany** (1871).—It is a truism, but none the less true, that it was the Prussian schoolmaster who gained the battle of Sadowa. Success intensified rather than relaxed the efforts and ambitions of the mighty men who controlled the destinies of Prussia. Every energy was devoted to preparation for the next war, which, whoever the aggressor, all Europe foresaw would be with France. The Prussian generals, diplomats, and statesmen formed a galaxy rare in any age, and above them towered the king, Bismarck, and Von Moltke. "Let us work fast, gentlemen," said Bismarck. "Let us put Germany in the saddle. She will know how to ride." In 1868 Moltke laid before the king his plan of campaign in case of the invasion of France.

In a mad hour like an angry child France drew the sword. The Franco-Prussian War of 1870-1871, with the dethronement of the Napoleonic dynasty, the captivity of 400,000 French soldiers, and the humiliations of Sedan and Metz, was the result. To Prussia and to Germany it wrought realization of the enthusiastic dreams of Arndt and of the calmer projects of Frederick the Great, Stein, and Bismarck in the accomplishment of national unity. The blood, which all the German states shed together on the fields of France, cemented the bonds of race as nothing else could have done. The factious opposition of feudal traditions and local jealousies could not longer continue. The Reichstag in an address to the king of Prussia, presented on December 18, 1870, employed these words: "The North German parliament, in unison with the princes of Germany, approaches with the prayer that your Majesty will deign to consecrate the work of unification by accepting the imperial crown of Germany. The Teutonic crown on the head of your Majesty will inaugurate for the reëstablished empire of the German nation an era of honor, of

peace, of well-being, and of liberty secured under the protection of the laws."

The Palace of Versailles is the architectural masterpiece and favorite residence of Louis XIV, the arch-enemy of the Germans. More than half a century ago it was converted into an enormous historical picture-gallery and its walls were covered with countless splendid paintings representing all the French conquests and triumphs during hundreds of years. In the gorgeous throne-room of this palace, hung all around with the royal glories of its founder, the German Empire was proclaimed on January 18, 1871, and the king of Prussia accepted for himself and his descendants the imperial crown. No coronation at Frankfort or Berlin could have been so eloquent and so impressive. The shouts of the victorious assemblage, hailing a resurrected and united Germany, announced a new era, and woke echoes in the neighboring room where Louis XIV had died.

## THE THIRD FRENCH REPUBLIC

### (1871-1901)

**The Commune** (March 18-May 28, 1871).—A majority of the members of the National Assembly, though not venturing to overthrow the republic, inclined to a monarchical form of government. Therefore they were regarded with suspicion and even hated by a large section of the Parisian populace. The sufferings of the siege, indignation at the triumphal entry of the Germans, and the exasperation of failure had wrought the lower classes to frenzy. It was easy for the so-called Central Committee, representing every radical and anarchistic notion and strong in the support of the dregs of the people, to rouse the mob, unfurl the red flag, seize the city and all the fortifications except Mount Valerian, and proclaim the Commune. Some of the National Guard, still armed, rallied to their side. Eager for blood, they assassinated General Lecomte and General Thomas, who had fought well for France M. Thiers, the government officials,

THE PROCLAMATION OF KING WILLIAM OF PRUSSIA AS GERMAN EMPEROR IN THE THRONE ROOM AT VERSAILLES 1871

From the Painting by Anton von Werner

and the members of the Assembly had time to withdraw to Versailles.

Marshal MacMahon, now healed from his wounds, and many French prisoners of war had already returned. The marshal had the melancholy duty of placing himself at their head to put down an insurrection of their fellow-countrymen. It was necessary to undertake a regular siege and bombard the capital. Inside the city any semblance of order soon gave way to anarchy, but the insurgents fought with ferocity. They butchered Monseigneur Darboy,—the third archbishop of Paris who has fallen victim during this century to a Parisian mob,—the curate of the Madeleine, and the President of the Court of Appeals. In the quarter of Belleville they slaughtered sixty-two soldiers and priests whom they held as hostages. After the government troops had forced their way through the gates, a murderous hand-to-hand fight in the streets continued for seven days before resistance was quelled. Maddened by rage at defeat the communists sought to destroy all Paris and bury themselves in its ashes. The women were more demoniac than the men. They succeeded in burning the Hôtel de Ville, the Palace of the Legion of Honor, the Palace of the Tuileries, the Library of the Louvre, and many other public and private buildings. The column of the Place Vendôme they threw to the ground. The horrified troops showed scant mercy to their miserable captives. For a year there were court-martials and executions. Thirteen thousand persons were transported or condemned to prison for the crimes of the Commune. In the wars of 1500 years Paris had never suffered as at the hands of her own children in this insurrection.

**Thiers, President of the Republic** (1871-1873).—Thus, at the beginning of his presidency had devolved upon Thiers two cruel tasks. The one was to make peace with a foreign invader gorged with victory. The other was to extinguish civil war.

The sight of an army of occupation wounded the nation to the quick. With tireless energy and wonderful skill Thiers devoted himself to discharging the war indemnity of $1,000,000,000. By September, 1873, it had

all been paid, not in paper but in hard coin, and the last German soldier had recrossed the frontier. The president well deserved the title of "Liberator of the Territory," which was decreed him in public opinion.

How long the deputies of the Assembly should hold their seats had never been determined, and they governed without a constitution. Thiers was a liberal monarchist, but a patriot above all. He believed that under the circumstances only a republican form of government was possible for France. Thereby he incurred the hostility of the majority which was made up of legitimists, Orleanists, and imperialists. These groups were at variance with one another and agreed only in antagonism to the republic. Some were moved by loyalty to a dynasty; others by the dreaded specter of radicalism and the red flag. On May 23, 1873, by a test vote of 360 to 344, the Assembly expressed its desire that the president should change his policy. The old man, whose life of seventy-six years had been consecrated to his country, preferred to resign.

**Presidency of Marshal MacMahon** (1873-1879).—On the same day the Assembly elected Marshal MacMahon, Duke of Magenta, as his successor. This soldier of the empire was supposed to be Orleanist at heart. He was a man of upright character, universally esteemed, but cast in the mold of a general rather than of a statesman. The Orleanist Duke de Broglie was made minister of foreign affairs. In the new ministry all the three monarchist groups were represented. The republicans were likewise split into three sections: the Left Center, or conservative republicans; the Left, or more advanced republicans; the Extreme Left, or radicals. The last faction were under the control of Gambetta, a natural orator and skilled politician who, despite his restless temperament, knew how to temporize and wait.

The republic existed de facto, but had never been officially decreed. The Orleanists fused with the legitimists and consented to proclaim the childless Henry, Count of Chambord, as king, the succession to devolve on the Count of Paris, the head of the house of Orleans. The vote of the Assembly seemed secured for the grand-

son of Charles X, when the monarchist schemes were wrecked on the question of the color of a flag. The Count of Chambord refused to recognize the tricolor, associated with the Revolution and the empire, and made his acceptance of the throne conditional upon the restoration of the white flag. Henry IV had declared that Paris is worth a mass. His descendant, Henry of Chambord, chose to reject a throne rather than abandon the symbol of his house. Negotiations could go no farther, for the tricolor was interwoven with all the later life of France. The disappointed monarchists together with the republican Left Center voted that the presidency of Marshal MacMahon should continue for seven years (November 20, 1873). Alarmed by the progress of imperialism, the Assembly, on January 30, 1875, by a majority of one recognized the Republic as the definite government of France.

Meanwhile, the deputies toiled laboriously at the formation of a provisional constitution, which was finally voted on February 25, 1875. This constitution was added to or modified several times in the course of the year. It provided for a Chamber of 733 deputies elected by universal suffrage for a term of four years, and for a Senate of 300 members, 225 to be elected by the departments and colonies for a term of nine years—seventy-five going out of office every three years—and seventy-five by the national assembly for life. The president of the Republic was to be chosen, not by a plebiscite, but by the Senate and Chamber of Deputies meeting in joint session. He was to hold office for seven years and could be reëlected. His power was to resemble that of a constitutional sovereign and his ministers were responsible to the Chambers. The attributes of the two houses were poorly defined, and were sure to be the cause of future contention. Distrust of or indifference to the will of the people was a marked feature in the elaboration of the constitution. Thus Versailles, and not Paris, was declared the seat of government and legislation. Moreover, each faction sought to so adjust the provisions as to perpetuate itself. The Senate was carefully designed as a bulwark of conservatism or an obstructive force.

The Assembly dissolved in December, 1875. The elections gave a strong majority in the Chamber to the republicans. M. Dufaure became President of the Council, or prime minister, with M. Leon Say as minister of finance. He was succeeded a few months later by M. Jules Simon, an orator and versatile writer as well as accomplished statesman. He endeavored to serve the nation rather than a party, and to maintain a middle course between the conservatives and the radicals, who daily became more hostile to each other. Religious questions intensified the dispute. The prime minister satisfied none and alienated all.

The republican sentiment was daily becoming stronger in the country, but Marshal MacMahon was too much bound by traditions and of too inflexible a nature to understand or conform to the march of public opinion. On May 16, 1877, he brought about the resignation of M. Simon, and appointed a monarchist ministry whose principal members were the Orleanist Duke de Broglie and the imperialist M. de Fourtou. The Senate was compliant and approving, but the refractory Chamber of Deputies was prorogued for a month. When it reassembled, by an immense majority it passed a vote of lack of confidence in the ministry. The Senate authorized the dissolution of the Chamber, which was at once dissolved. A coup d'état was dreaded, whereby some sort of monarchy should be imposed, but the monarchists could not agree upon whose brow to place the crown.

Then followed all over the country the most genuine electoral campaign in which France had ever engaged. The government applied all the pressure in its power to determine the result. The marshal traversed the country, his partisans believing many votes would be influenced by his military renown and by the memory of his great services under the empire. Gambetta organized the opposition and everywhere delivered impassioned and convincing speeches. For a time he allowed his radicalism to slumber that he might rally under one banner all the anti-monarchists of whatever camp.

In the heat of the electoral battle Thiers died at St. Germain. He, more than any other man, had been the

acknowledged chief of the liberal party. National gratitude conspired with party loyalty to make his funeral the occasion of an imposing and overwhelming demonstration.

The republican victory was magnificent. In the new Chamber the opponents of the marshal had a majority of 110, which was further increased by invalidating the elections of fifty-two government candidates. They refused to vote the budget unless the president chose his cabinet from the parliamentary majority. He yielded, and called to the ministry MM. Dufaure, Waddington, Marcère, de Freycinet, and Leon Say.

The following year there was a truce in political strife. France and Paris united to further the International Exposition of 1878, endeavoring to eclipse its brilliant predecessor of 1867. The seats of seventy-five senators became vacant in 1879. The success of the republicans was so complete as to assure them henceforth a majority in that hitherto conservative body. Marshal MacMahon judged his position untenable and resigned the chief magistracy (January 30, 1879).

His presidency was the long crisis in the history of the France of to-day. The longer the crisis continued, the more definite and stable the result. Since then president, Chamber, and Senate have been in political accord as to the system of government. That 16th of May, 1877, when M. Simon was dismissed and the Duke de Broglie appointed prime minister, was the Sadowa of monarchical restoration in France.

**Presidency of M. Grévy** (1879-1887).—M. Grévy was at once elected president of the Republic. Gambetta succeeded him as president of the Chamber of Deputies. Frequent changes in the ministry followed one another, the conservatives growing weaker and the radical tendency becoming continually more marked. The death of the Prince Imperial in South Africa (June 8, 1880), where he had joined a British expedition against the Zulus, blasted the rising hopes of the imperialists, who could not agree as to who should be regarded as heir of his claims.

The seat of government was removed from Versailles

to Paris. The schools and convents of the Jesuits were suppressed. A special authorization was required for the existence of the other religious orders. Public education was extended while removed from the hands of the clergy. All persons still under condemnation for participation in the Commune were granted amnesty. The 14th of July, the anniversary of the capture of the Bastile, was declared a national holiday. M. Jules Ferry became prime minister, succeeding M. de Freycinet, who was not considered sufficiently energetic in enforcing the decrees against the religious orders. An expedition to Tunis forced the bey to sign a treaty, placing his country under the protectorate of France. Gambetta at last became prime minister (November 14, 1881). Much was expected of him, but his old-time energy and fire seemed to have disappeared. Nor did he receive the support of the Chamber in the measures he proposed. After holding office for a little more than two months he resigned, and died soon after, never having attained the presidency, the goal of his ambition.

In Egypt complications arose. The khedive had confided the supervision of the finances to two controllers, appointed by Great Britain and France respectively, so as to protect the French and British holders of Egyptian bonds. Judging the interests of their subjects endangered, the two Powers determined to interfere (1882). After much indecision France refused to coöperate in the military intervention, which was carried out by Great Britain, and the dual control abolished.

In Madagascar the Hovas encroached on the privileges of certain French residents. The French admiral who commanded the squadron in the Indian Ocean demanded that the northwestern part of the island should be placed under a French protectorate and a large indemnity be paid (1883). The queen of the Hovas refused. Her capital, Tamatave, was bombarded, but the French afterwards were signally defeated. Finally by treaty it was arranged that administration of internal affairs should be left to the queen, but that France should control the foreign relations of the island.

Then followed (1884) an inglorious war with China,

in consequence of French incursions into territory over which the Chinese asserted suzerainty. After terrible loss and expense the French were confirmed in the possession of Annam and Tonquin. The by no means fruitful expeditions to Madagascar and China caused the fall of M. Jules Ferry (1885), who had been prime minister for twenty-five months. In 1885 the constitution was revised and some of its conservative features expunged. The Senate was deprived of any right to interfere in the budget, and it was determined that henceforth no senator should be elected for life. A law was also passed enforcing scrutin de liste, or the election of deputies upon a general departmental ticket. By the previous system of scrutin d'arrondissement each deputy had been elected singly by the vote of the district which he represented.

In the elections of 1885 the radicals and socialists, as well as the monarchists, made large gains at the expense of the moderate republicans. Thereupon the government took stringent measures against the princes of houses formerly ruling in France. It was intrusted with discretionary power to remove them all from the country, and was furthermore ordered to expel all claimants of the throne and their heirs. Therefore a presidential decree banished Prince Napoleon and his son, Prince Victor, and the Count of Paris with his son, the Duke of Orleans. The names of all the members of the Bonaparte and Orleans families were stricken from the army roll.

On the expiration of his term M. Grévy had been reelected president. His son-in-law, M. Wilson, became implicated in scandals arising over the sale of decorations and of appointments in the army. M. Grévy unwisely interfered to protect his son-in-law from justice. Though not accused of complicity in the crime, he was forced by the indignant Chambers to resign (December 2, 1887). He was then eighty years of age.

**Presidency of M. Sadi Carnot** (1887-1894).—The choice of the Chambers fell upon a worthy and illustrious candidate, M. Sadi Carnot. He was a grandson of that Carnot who, in 1793 during the Revolution, had proved

himself unequaled as a military organizer and was called by his countrymen "the genius of victory."

The most prominent figure at that time in France was General Boulanger. His theatrical bearing and his supposed, but unproven, abilities made him a popular idol. For insubordination in the army he had been placed upon the retired list. A duel, in which he was worsted by a civilian, M. Floquet, the prime minister, did not damage his prestige. Elected deputy by enormous majorities, first in the department of Dordogne, and then in the department of Nord, he resigned his seat, but was then triumphantly elected on one and the same day in the departments of Nord, Charente-Inférieure, and the Somme. His political platform of revision of the constitution and dissolution of the Chamber enabled him to draw into his following all the disaffected and discontented of whatever party or class. The government was alarmed at his intrigues and prosecuted him before the High Court of Justice. Struck with sudden panic he did not present himself for trial, but fled to Great Britain. The trial proceeded in his absence. It was proved that he had received 3,000,000 francs from the Orleanist Duchess d'Uzès to further his political machinations. His popularity at once vanished. Finally (September 30, 1891), he committed suicide on the grave of Madame de Bonnemain, who had followed him in his exile and supported him by her bounty for two years.

Despite the fiasco of General Boulanger an urgent demand continued for a revision of the constitution. The revision bill introduced by M. Floquet was received coldly in the Chamber, whereupon he resigned, and M. Tirard, an economist, formed a new ministry. The scrutin d'arrondissement had previously been restored, the government considering the scrutin de liste more favorable to the scheme of political adventurers.

The ministry of M. Tirard and of his successor, M. de Freycinet, devoted special attention to industrial questions. The system of free trade which had prevailed in France since 1860 was succeeded by high duties on nearly all imports. A special tariff with far lower rates

was drawn up to secure reciprocity treaties with foreign countries. Great discontent prevailed among the working classes. The annual May-day labor demonstrations had become a menace to law and order. Frequent strikes produced armed conflicts between the soldiers and the mob. To appease the agitation the government founded a Labor Bureau and introduced bills for the protection of women and children in the factories.

So far the Catholic Church and the Republic had been generally regarded as hostile to each other. This feeling was an injury to both. In 1890 an illustrious prelate, Cardinal Lavigerie, archbishop of Algiers, published a letter, declaring it the true policy of the Catholic Church to support the Republic. At once the cardinal was bitterly denounced by the reactionary section of his co-religionists, but his policy was warmly commended by Pope Leo XIII. In consequence there were for years—indeed, up to the time of the Combes ministry—far more amicable relations between the Church and the state.

In 1892 France was convulsed by the Panama scandal. Twelve years before M. Ferdinand de Lesseps, to whom the Suez Canal was due, organized the Panama Canal Company to construct a ship canal across the Isthmus of Panama. His immense reputation was supposed to guarantee success. Shares were eagerly subscribed for, especially by the laboring classes, and the government also advanced large loans. In 1889, after $280,000,000 had been expended and small progress made, the company dissolved. Thousands of subscribers were ruined. The government prosecuted the directors for misappropriation of funds and for bribery of public officials. M. Baïhaut, minister of public works in 1886, was proved to have received 375,000 francs, though he demanded 1,000,000. Other deputies and state officers were convicted and sentenced. M. de Lesseps himself, though on his death-bed, was condemned to five years' imprisonment and to pay a fine of 5000 francs. During the investigation one cabinet toppled after another. In April, 1893, as the storm abated, M. Dupuy formed a ministry. While the French were punishing civilized criminals at home, they were carrying on a tedious war

in Africa against the barbarous king of Dahomey. Finally, his capital, Ahomey, was taken, and in 1894 his territories made a French protectorate.

The elections of 1893 revealed the marked progress of socialism, and a corresponding decrease of conservatism among the voters. When M. Dupuy proposed an anti-socialistic program to the newly elected Chamber, he could not obtain a vote of confidence. M. Casimir-Périer was invited to form a cabinet. At the time anarchism seemed to terrorize Paris and France. Many magistrates were attacked. In the Chamber of Deputies an anarchist, not a member, hurled a bomb at the president. Though laws were enacted against the propagation of anarchistic doctrines, "there was an epidemic of bombs in Paris in the spring of 1894."

On June 24, 1894, President Carnot paid a formal visit to Lyons. As he rode through the streets an Italian rushed before him and stabbed him, shouting, "Long live anarchy!" The illustrious victim died that same night. He was universally mourned. His dignified and courtly manners, no less than his spotless character, had commanded the admiration of his countrymen.

**Presidency of M. Casimir-Périer** (1894).—M. Casimir-Périer, the candidate of the moderate republicans, was elected by the Senate and Chamber three days after the assassination of M. Carnot. But he was passionately hated by the socialists and radicals, who employed every weapon to break down his authority. Corruption in connection with certain railway franchises was proved against some of his friends, and this compelled the cabinet to retire. Finding it difficult to form a new ministry and disheartened by sudden unpopularity, M. Casimir-Périer resigned the presidency.

**Presidency of M. Faure** (1895-1899). **The Dreyfus Case.**—The three candidates were M. Brisson, President of the Chamber, M. Waldeck-Rousseau, and M. Felix Faure. The latter was elected (January 17). His occupancy of the chair was distinguished by shrewdness and tact. During a tour through southeastern France in 1897 his democratic ways and close attention to whatever had to do with the army increased his popularity. An

intimate alliance with Russia has of late years been greatly desired by the French, who regarded themselves as otherwise politically isolated in Europe. They were much gratified, when at the opening of the Baltic Canal in 1895, the Russian and French fleets in company entered the harbor of Kiel and when General Dragomanoff and the Russian ambassador attended the maneuvers of five army corps, numbering more than 120,000 men, in eastern France. Enthusiasm reached its limit on October 5, 1896, when the Tsar and Tsaritsa reviewed the French fleet off Cherbourg. Afterwards their majesties visited Paris, and the capital abandoned itself to festivities for three days. In August, 1897, President Faure returned the visit of his imperial guests, and was magnificently entertained. Afterwards he received such an ovation in France as is rarely extended a conqueror.

His first prime minister, M. Ribot, was replaced (October 30, 1895) by M. Bourgeois, and France had for the first time a cabinet composed wholly of radicals. Then the newspaper, *La France,* raked over again the embers of the Panama scandal, publishing the names of 104 members of the Chamber belonging to different parties, who, it asserted, had received bribes from the Panama Canal Company. There was a furious stir and further investigation was ordered, but little came of it. Another scandal, as to the concession of phosphate lands in Algeria, also made much noise. M. Bourgeois was succeeded as prime minister by M. Méline, he by M. Brisson, and he by M. Dupuy, who formed the thirty-sixth cabinet which had administered affairs since the resignation of M. Thiers in 1873.

During the presidency of M. Faure much progress was made in reconciling moderate republicanism and the Catholic Church. On the other hand, antagonism to the Jews permeated almost all classes. The socialists started the movement, denouncing them as holders of property; but the aversion later shown in France was based upon religion and race. The Dreyfus case furnishes a deplorable example. Captain Dreyfus, one of the few Jewish officers in the army, was arrested in 1894 on a charge of selling military plans to foreigners. De-

clared guilty by secret court-martial, he was sentenced to transportation for life. Many believed that on a fair trial his innocence would have been evident. M. Zola, the famous novelist, championed his cause, but was twice arrested on charge of libeling the government, and twice condemned. Meanwhile, the agitation increased. Finally it was proved that at least a portion of the papers employed to commit Captain Dreyfus were forgeries. The chief of the French intelligence bureau confessed a share in these forgeries and committed suicide. The chief of staff, General Boisdeffre, resigned. Dreyfus was brought back from Cayenne, and at Rennes again submitted to court-martial. On September 9, 1899, by a vote of five to two, he was convicted of the gravest crime an officer could commit, but none the less was recommended to mercy. Ten days afterward he received a full pardon from the government. The nature of the verdict and the subsequent pardon were regarded as a confession of his innocence and that his condemnation had been due to reasons of state. Finally, this most notorious miscarriage of justice was righted by a verdict, rendered on July 12, 1906, by the Court of Cassation. This supreme French tribunal quashed the verdict of the Rennes court-martial and, without trial, proclaimed Dreyfus innocent, reinstated him in the army, and promoted him in rank.

**Presidency of M. Loubet.**—President Faure died suddenly on the night of February 16, 1899. Two days later M. Émile Loubet, President of the Senate, was elected in his place. During his administration public attention centered mainly upon the Dreyfus case and the Universal Exposition of 1900. The latter was opened (April 14) by President Loubet in person, continued open for 212 days, and, according to the official reports, was visited by over 50,000,000 persons. M. Waldeck-Rousseau, whose policy was styled "moderate but progressive," became prime minister on the fall of the Dupuy Ministry (June, 1899).

## THE GERMAN EMPIRE

### (1871-1901)

**The Imperial Constitution.**—The constitution was promulgated on April 16, 1871, in the name of the king of Prussia, as head of the North German Confederation, of the kings of Bavaria and Würtemberg and the Grand Dukes of Baden and Hesse. It was thus granted by five accordant princes and not wrought out in a constitutional assembly. It formed the code of twenty-six distinct states now all united under the iron rule of the Hohenzollerns and submitted to the same rigid discipline in war and diplomacy. Surfeited with such military glory as has been seldom achieved, the Germans, content for a time to forget their old aspirations after liberty, hailed the new system with transports of joy. Hitherto one had been a Prussian, Bavarian, Hessian subject. Now the local name was obscured by the larger title of German subject. A man's civil rights were no longer local, but equal and similar all over the empire. The former German Empire was centrifugal, each emperor being chosen by election and each state retaining its feudal laws. The modern German Empire is centripetal, heredity in the Prussian house transmitting the succession with the precision of a well-oiled machine, and the imperial constitution being paramount to all customs and enactments of the various states. The former Empire of Germany was a vague political expression. The modern German Empire is a definite political fact.

According to its organic law, the legislative authority was exercised by a Bundesrath or Federal Council, composed of representatives of the vassal princes of the empire, and by a Reichstag, or Imperial Diet, composed of deputies elected by the people. There was one deputy for each 100,000 inhabitants, and he held his seat three years. In the Federal Council Prussia had only seventeen votes out of fifty-eight. The consent of the Bundesrath was necessary to declare war, except in case

of the territory being suddenly invaded. Whenever one-third of its members desired, it was to be convoked in special session. All foreign policy was to be directed by the imperial chancellor. Berlin was in general the center of imperial government and legislation, but the seat of the Imperial Tribunal was at Leipzig, and the accountant-general's office at Potsdam. The army on a peace footing numbered more than 400,000 men. Its military organization, in awful efficiency hitherto unapproached in human history, enabled it in case of war to put into the field 1,456,677 men, perfectly disciplined and equipped.

**The Alliance of the Three Emperors** (1871-1876).—All Europe might well be alarmed for its own safety after the victories and consolidation of Germany. There was no continental power, except Russia, which was not certain to go down before the new state in case of war. Not only smaller neighboring states but France herself trembled before the armed colossus which had arisen among them. Austria had nothing to hope except by peace. She manifested a strong desire to be on amicable terms with the new Power which had thrust her out of Germany. The Tsar Alexander II, a man of peace, was the friend and admirer of the Emperor William. The three emperors, Alexander II, William I, and Francis Joseph drew together in a friendly understanding, which soon came to be called the Alliance of the Three Emperors. It was only when Russia drew her sword in 1877 to rescue her coreligionists, the Bulgarians, from further outrages at the hands of the Ottomans, that this friendly understanding was disturbed.

**Organization of Alsace-Lorraine** (1871).—The inhabitants of the annexed territory, though German in origin, were intensely French in sentiment. With indescribable sorrow they saw themselves transferred to Germany. Many emigrated rather than submit to foreign domination, and a large number abandoned their homes and removed to France. Alsace and Lorraine were at first governed as an imperial province under military dictatorship and dependent upon the imperial chancellor. Allowed representation in the Reichstag in 1874, their

fifteen deputies unitedly and boldly protested against their annexation by force and then solemnly withdrew. Bismarck believed that by shrewdly permitting them a degree of home rule their opposition might be gradually undermined. They were granted a Provincial Committee to sit at Strasburg and discuss all bills, which were afterwards submitted to the Reichstag, concerning their domestic and fiscal affairs. Gradually the functions of this committee were enlarged. In 1879 the government of the province was removed from the direction of the chancellor and intrusted to a statthalter or imperial envoy to reside at Strasburg. Marshal Manteuffel, a distinguished soldier and statesman, was appointed to the position. By mild and conciliatory measures he did his utmost to reconcile the people, but in vain. Their aversion was only the more openly expressed. Then followed a policy of violent repression. The chancellor, Caprivi, declared in 1890 that the attempt to foster German feeling having failed, nothing was left but to dig deeper the ditch which separated Alsace-Lorraine from France. Though powerless to resist, the Alsace-Lorrainers have become no less sullen and determined in their anti-German sentiments. With the opening years of the twentieth century there is becoming evident a tendency to treat these provinces with more regard for the rights of their inhabitants to local self-government.

**The Culturkampf** (1873-1887).—Bismarck, now a prince and chancellor of the empire, had met nothing but success. In the so-called Culturkampf he undertook a task beyond his powers, in which he was to encounter his great political defeat. He had unified Germany by merging it under one central power. It was necessary that the Catholic Church in Prussia, as well as all other churches, should pass through the same process of centralization and be merged in and made subordinate to the state. In 1873 the Prussian minister of public worship, Dr. Falk, introduced and succeeded in passing the so-called Falk or May Laws. Ostensibly these laws aimed at securing liberty to the laity, a national and German rather than an ultramontane training to the clergy and protection for the inferior clergy against their superiors.

They provided that all theological seminaries should be controlled by the state, that the state should examine all candidates for the priesthood, and should furthermore have the right to approve or reject all ecclesiastical appointments. Pope Pius IX remonstrated in an urgent letter to the emperor. The Catholic bishops collectively declared they could not obey these laws. But the laws were none the less vigorously enforced by fine, imprisonments, and exile. It was religious persecution on an enormous scale in the latter half of the nineteenth century. Within eight years' time the parishes of more than one-fifth of the 8500 Catholic priests in Prussia were vacant, and no successors could be appointed. The perfect union of the Catholic clergy and laity, with no weapon but passive resistance, won the victory in the end. The May Laws were suspended in 1881 and later on practically repealed. After 1887 all state interference in the administration of the Church and in the education of the priesthood was wholly abandoned.

**Economic Policy** (1878-1890).—Up to 1848 the Zollverein had favored a protective policy. Afterwards in the sixties had followed a system of reciprocity treaties with France, Austria, Great Britain, Italy, and other countries showing a marked tendency toward free trade. The national liberals advocated abolition of all duties on raw materials, a policy supposed to enjoy the approval of Prince Bismarck. But in December, 1878, the chancellor sent a communication to the Federal Council, wherein he condemned the existing policy and advocated higher rates as a means to increase the revenues of the state. His will was law. A new tariff was introduced and passed. It placed heavy duties on raw materials and considerably increased the duties on textile goods and other articles already taxed. Subsequently, until his fall in 1890, the tariff was forced higher and higher.

**The Triple Alliance** (1879—).—Only the principal facts and not all the details are known in reference to the formation of the triple alliance of Germany, Austria, and Italy. After the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-1878, whereby she had secured Herzegovina and Bosnia, Austria was uneasy as to the safety of the Russian frontier.

Neither Austria nor Russia was likely to forget the part the former had played in the Crimean War. So she concluded a secret treaty with Germany in 1879, "an alliance for peace and mutual defense," in case either Power should be attacked by Russia or by some state supported by Russia. Italy, without reason to dread attack, but probably desirous of imperial fellowship and recognition, asked to be admitted to this alliance. Meanwhile, from 1887 to 1890 another secret treaty existed between Germany and Russia which only became known to the world through the revelations of Bismarck in 1896.

**Death of Emperor William I** (March 9, 1888).—The absolutist policy, with which he began his reign as king of Prussia, had been maintained by him as German emperor and won a magnificent success. The appreciation of his great achievements had made the sovereign, who was hated and hooted at the beginning of his reign, the idol of his people at the end. His simple and homely ways, his blunt soldierly bearing, and his chivalric devotion to his mother's memory won the hearts even of those Germans who were the most hostile to his political principles. His death at the age of ninety-one was received with a consternation of grief. Though Bismarck and Moltke outlived him, it was an anxious question in the minds of many whether the imperial fabric he had built up would survive his departure.

**Frederick I** (1888).—The Crown Prince Frederick succeeded. He had made a splendid record as a soldier in the Austro-Prussian and Franco-Prussian wars. On several occasions he had shown liberal tendencies, which his marriage with Victoria, crown princess of Great Britain and eldest daughter of Queen Victoria, was supposed to fortify. He had even protested against the Army bill of 1862 and given public expression of his dissent from a subsequent despotic action of the government. But a fatal throat disease had fastened upon him before his accession. It was only as a doomed and speechless invalid that he occupied the throne. His three months' reign is memorable for his spirit of self-forgetfulness and devotion to duty.

**Reign of William II** (1888—).—William II was twenty-nine years old when he became emperor. His first proclamation was addressed to the army and navy, and he has manifested ever since an almost passionate interest in these branches of the public service. His speech on opening the Reichstag, as well as his first address to the German people, indicated his absolutist policy. Louis XIV himself, in the seventeenth century, was not a more convinced impersonification of the divine right of kings. "The supreme guardian of law and order," he regards himself as crowned by God, as the anointed elector of the divine will, and as entitled to the unquestioning obedience of his subjects. A wonderful activity or restlessness has been the most prominent characteristic of his reign. No other European sovereign has been such a constant traveler to foreign lands. No other European sovereign has so interfered not only in all branches of administration, but in all matters relating to public, social, and religious life. A ready speaker, there is hardly a topic left untouched in his speeches, and his speeches have been delivered on all occasions. Always the dominant sentiment, whatever the theme, is the doctrine of autocracy.

The first year of his reign was marked by an event of historic significance. In October, 1888, the free cities of Hamburg and Bremen, whose right to remain free ports had been ratified in the imperial constitution of 1871, renounced their special and ancient privileges and completely merged themselves in the common Fatherland. Great pomp attended the ceremony. The emperor came in person to accept their patriotic sacrifice. Except that their sovereignty was represented in the Bundesrath by the side of that of princes, the last vestige of the Hanseatic League had disappeared.

Between the veteran chancellor, who had controlled the helm for almost a generation, and the youthful emperor, eager to exercise his power, there was sure to be friction. The temper of Bismarck, by no means pliable, had not softened with success and age. The chief of the staff, the Count of Waldersee, and other courtiers fostered the growing alienation. The chan-

EMPEROR WILLIAM II, OF GERMANY AND HIS STAFF AT A MILITARY MANOEUVRE

From the Painting by Hans W. Schmidt

cellor persisted in a bill which the emperor disapproved. The emperor issued a decree in a sense which the chancellor had always opposed. The chancellor refused to repeat a certain conversation, although urged to do so by the emperor. On March 17, 1890, came a message from the emperor that he was waiting for the chancellor's resignation. The chancellor refused to resign. Then followed a direct order demanding his resignation. Bismarck in his fall did not manifest the self-control he had shown in his powerful days, and filled Germany with his complaints. It was his mistake to believe himself still essential to the state, when his work had been long since done. Yet the emperor might have dealt more gently with the old man, to whom the empire owed its existence and to whom he himself was indebted for his imperial crown. In 1894 the sovereign and the subject were publicly reconciled amid universal rejoicing, and the latter received an ovation from all classes at Berlin. Afterwards he exercised no further influence upon affairs, but quietly resided at his castle of Friedrichsruhe until his death (July 30, 1898).

The Baltic or Kiel Canal—a work of immense utility—was officially inaugurated in 1891. Beginning at Holtenau on the Bay of Kiel, it joins the Elbe fifteen miles from its mouth. Although sixty-one miles in length it requires no locks. The German navy can henceforth pass from the Baltic through German territory to the North Sea, and avoid the tortuous and dangerous voyage among the Danish islands and through the Cattegat and the Skager Rack.

## ITALY IN THE LAST HALF OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

**Condition of the Italian Peninsula in 1850.**—The present of Italy was never darker and her outlook upon the future more discouraging than in the summer of 1850. The revolutionary war of 1848, that had swept over the country from the lagoons of Venice to the extremities

of Sicily, had receded, and left nothing but defeat and disappointment behind.

Italy at that time comprised the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies, the States of the Church, the grand duchy of Tuscany, the duchies of Parma and Modena, the Lombardo-Venetian territory, and the kingdom of Piedmont or Sardinia. In the Two Sicilies Ferdinand II, no longer dreading popular outbreak, had suspended the constitution which he had granted, and from his palace in Naples worked his brutal and bloody will without check or hindrance. In the States of the Church, stretching in irregular diagonal across Italy from the Tuscan Sea to the mouths of the Po, Pope Pius IX threw the influence of his exalted office on the side of despotism. Under the influence of Cardinal Antonelli and the protection of French bayonets he ruled as tyrannically as any temporal prince. In Tuscany the Archduke Leopold II, himself the grandson of an Austrian emperor, turned his back upon his brief compromise with the partisans of reform and maintained an Austrian garrison in Florence. In Parma and Modena Charles III and the cruel Francis V, by the aid of Austrian troops, restored an absolute government and terrorized over opposition. Lombardy and Venetia, placed under martial law, were governed from the fortress of Verona by the merciless Radetzki and Haynau, the "hyena of Brescia."

The only exception to the universal darkness was found in Piedmont. In that tiny country of 4,000,000 inhabitants, the "Fundamental Statute," a sort of charter, was still in force. It possessed a dynasty of its own and a national flag and a national army. Though defeated, it had in two campaigns dared to resist Austria. But the heroic Charles Albert, by failure, had been forced to abdicate and die in exile, leaving his throne to his son, Victor Emmanuel. The young king had borne himself bravely at the battle of Novara. But his queen was an Austrian archduchess, he was unpopular with his subjects, and his abilities were a matter of doubt. There was little cohesion or sympathy between the four territories making the kingdom of Piedmont or Sardinia. These were Piedmont proper, buttressed against the Alps

and inhabited by a brave and simple people; southern Liguria, with Genoa, a republican center, ill disposed to the dynasty; Savoy, on the western slope of the Alps, French in language and sentiment; and the island of Sardinia, which remained apart from the life of Europe. Yet in this sparsely populated, ill-connected country the expulsion of the Austrians and the political unification of the peninsula were preparing.

**Count Cavour.**—In every other respect no two men are more dissimilar than Prince Bismarck and Count Cavour, but they parallel each other in the main purpose of their lives and the magnificence of its accomplishment. Cavour is the Italian Bismarck. Unlike his German prototype he did not live to see his work complete, but he set in motion those forces which were to expel Austria from Italy as Bismarck expelled her from Germany, and to place on the map a kingdom of Italy as Bismarck placed there a German Empire. Himself a less spectacular figure and moving in a more contracted arena, he does not so center the gaze of mankind. Yet no other statesman of contemporary times is equally worthy to be placed next to the great German.

By birth an aristocrat, always a monarchist, a Catholic but a moderate, Cavour was detested by the extremists of all parties. Prime minister in 1852, he welcomed to Piedmont the political exiles from all over Italy, and thus early caused it to be understood that in his little country was the only refuge of Italian patriotism and liberty.

**Piedmont in the Crimean War** (1855-1856).—When the Crimean War broke out, Cavour determined that Piedmont should actively participate in the conflict. Great Britain, in need of troops, proposed to subsidize the Piedmontese. Cavour offered to enter the Franco-British alliance, not as a mercenary, but as an equal. His proposal to maintain an army of 15,000 men in the Crimea as long as the war lasted was gladly accepted. He more than kept his word. At the decisive battle of Tchernaya the discipline of his countrymen and the accuracy of their aim provoked admiration. The timid and hesitating course of Austria during the war had exasperated France

and Great Britain. When at the Congress of Paris Cavour, as representative of Piedmont, skillfully drew the attention of the plenipotentiaries to the evils of Austrian rule in Italy and the deplorable state of the peninsula, his words fell upon sympathetic ears. Thus the Italian question was definitely posed. It could not be thereafter forgotten till it received definite solution.

**The War of 1859.**—At first Cavour had counted on the active assistance of Great Britain. Disappointed in his hopes, he made overtures to Napoleon. In his secret interview with that ruler at Plombières (July, 1858), the conditions and terms of alliance between France and Piedmont were verbally agreed upon. In April, 1859, Austria made the diplomatic blunder of taking the aggressive and forcing on the war. Victor Emmanuel appealed to his compatriots of the center and south. For years secret societies had existed over Italy, united under the mystic symbol, *Verdi*, the initials of the words Vittorio Emmanuele Re d'Italia. The French and Piedmontese victories of Montebello and Magenta inspired them to courage and action. Popular risings in Tuscany, Parma, and Modena drove out the dukes. The Romagna, the papal territories along the Adriatic, likewise took fire and the papal officials were expelled. The overwhelming victory of Solferino was followed by the sudden peace of Villafranca, agreed upon by Napoleon and Francis Joseph. This treaty seemed to shatter all the hopes of Italian union and independence.

By its terms Lombardy was to be united to Piedmont, and Venetia, still under the rule of Austria, was to be made part of an Italian federation under the presidency of the Pope. This petty gain was trivial compared with what Cavour and the Italians had hoped. The Dukes of Tuscany and Modena were to return to their states. The formidable quadrilateral—Peschiera, Mantua, Verona, and Legnago—was retained by Austria. Victor Emmanuel could do nothing but accept the hard conditions as far as he himself and his country were concerned, but he would promise nothing farther. Cavour was broken-hearted. Utterly losing his self-control, in a bitter two hours' interview, he overwhelmed his sovereign

with reproaches and withdrew from the ministry. The definite Treaty of Zurich (November 10) confirmed the decisions of Villafranca.

**Successful Revolutions. Victor Emmanuel and Garibaldi** (1859-1865).—The king took possession of Lombardy. For the banished dukes to regain their duchies was more difficult. In August the assemblies of Parma, Modena, and Tuscany declared that their former rulers had forfeited all their rights, demanded annexation to Piedmont, and recognized Victor Emmanuel as their sovereign. The Romagna did the same. Plebiscites by almost unanimous votes confirmed these acts. The son of Charles Albert had become king of 11,000,000 people. In January, 1860, Cavour again became prime minister.

In Naples Francis II had succeeded his father, Ferdinand II of evil memory. Deaf to the counsels of the French and British cabinets, he resolved to continue the same policy. All Sicily rebelled. Because of diplomatic pressure from abroad, the astute Cavour could not interfere or accept the propositions of the revolutionist Mazzini, but he could allow others to act. Garibaldi, with 1000 resolute men, hurried from Genoa (May 5, 1860) and landed at Marsala in Sicily. He was not a statesman, hardly a general, but only a hero who rushed on in his red shirt sure that others would follow and careless whether they did nor not. In three days he stormed Palermo. The battle of Milazzo gave him Messina and the whole island (July 20). He crossed the strait and marched on Naples. Francis II fled from his capital (September 6). The next day Garibaldi entered Naples without opposition and was hailed as a liberator. He was at once accepted as dictator of the Two Sicilies.

But the tempestuous success of the revolution was a danger and menace to Cavour. Mazzini, the republicans of the south, and even Garibaldi had no love for the house of Piedmont. They might easily become its foes. Meanwhile, the courts of Europe held Cavour responsible for the whirlwind that was unloosed. The government of every European state was unfriendly or openly hostile. The storm that had swept Sicily and Naples was ready

to burst on Rome; but Rome was garrisoned by French troops and behind them was the threatening form of Napoleon. A single false step on the part of Cavour might ruin all that Italy and Piedmont had gained in twelve anxious years. Indecision was fatal. Should Cavour yield to the conservative warnings of Europe, or should he now without reserve head the party of action? There could be no compromise with Garibaldi, who was resolved to proclaim Italian independence from the top of the Quirinal.

The prime minister invited the Pope to disband his foreign army. When Pius IX refused, he ordered the Piedmontese generals to invade the papal states and rescue them from despotism and anarchy. After a brave defense by the French general, De Lamoricière, all the still remaining papal territory on the Adriatic was in the hands of the Piedmontese, but the Eternal City was left to the Pope. In a calm and sagacious speech, delivered before the Parliament, but really addressed to the bar of Europe, Cavour declared that he submitted the question of Rome and Venetia to the arbitrament of time. Francis II still resisted feebly, but obstinately. He then retained only a Sicilian citadel and the fortress of Gaeta. A plebiscite in the Two Sicilies and in the papal states of Umbria and the Marches by an almost unanimous vote declared for union with emancipated Italy and for Victor Emmanuel as king.

The monarch and the dictator held their formal but simple first interview near Teano (October 26). The Piedmontese troops and the Garibaldian volunteers threw themselves into each other's arms. Victor Emmanuel and Garibaldi galloped to meet each other. As they embraced, the armies shouted, "Long live Victor Emmanuel!" leaving it for Garibaldi to add, "king of Italy!"

All the Italian provinces, except Venetia and the papal territory on the Tuscan Sea, were now united under one flag. The tricolor of green, white, and red sheltered them all. On February 18, 1861, the first national parliament assembled at Turin to enact laws for a people of 22,000,000 souls. Then (June 6) Cavour died, worn

out by labor and success. He was succeeded by Baron Ricasoli, whom Signor Ratazzi soon replaced. The Roman question was keeping the kingdom in a ferment. Garibaldi resolved to settle it with the sword. Refusing to submit to the orders of the government, with a band of Sicilian volunteers he marched northward through Calabria. Encountered by the royal troops at Aspromonte, his followers were dispersed and he himself was wounded and made a prisoner. The ignominious necessity of firing upon the liberator forced the Ratazzi ministry from office. In the autumn of 1865 the capital was removed from Turin to Florence.

**Alliance with Prussia against Austria** (1866).—This alliance was equally advantageous to Prussia and Italy. Thereby Austria was compelled to divide her forces and dispatch to the southwest generals and troops sorely needed on her northern frontier. Italy lost rather than gained in military reputation by the reverses of General La Marmora and Admiral Persano at Custozza and Lissa. None the less her assistance had inclined the scale to the side of Prussia. She well deserved her reward in the acquisition of Venetia. Another almost unanimous plebiscite and Victor Emmanuel, on November 7, entered the city of the doges as its king.

**Rome the Capital of Italy** (1870).—The Italian heart was always turning to Rome. In 1866 Napoleon, according to his promise, withdrew the French garrison, but the Italian government was not free to interfere in the still remaining papal possessions. Garibaldi could not curb his impatience. A third time he marched an army upon Roman territory. In deference to the clerical party in France, Napoleon sent an expedition to support the Pope and Garibaldi was defeated at the battle of Mentana. The French prime minister, Rouher, formally declared, "Italy shall never enter Rome."

Again protected by French soldiers, the Pope felt himself secure, and assembled the Ecumenical Council (1869). Soon came upon France the disasters of the Franco-Prussian war, and she was forced to recall every arm on which she could rely. Her troops quitted Rome. The king, with earnest tenderness, implored the Pope to

recognize the inevitable trend of events, and, while relinquishing his temporal sovereignty, to resign himself to that independent and exalted position which the Italians desired him to occupy. The inflexible pontiff declared he would yield only to compulsion. The Italian forces delayed no longer, but occupied the city. By one more plebiscite, this time the last, the life-work of the dead Cavour received its coronation, and the peninsula, reunited, had again the same capital as in the days of Cæsar.

**The Last Years of Victor Emmanuel** (1870-1878).—The new state at the start was surrounded by peculiar difficulties and dangers. Foremost were those arising from the religious question. The Pope was not merely a dispossessed temporal prince, but the spiritual head of Catholic Christendom. He was bitterly opposed to everything in the new order. He would tolerate no suggestions of compromise. Against the excommunicated government of Victor Emmanuel he threw the whole influence of the Catholic priesthood and appealed for help to the Catholic Powers of Europe. The country was covered with monasteries and churches, which had absorbed the material wealth, while the people were stricken with poverty. To touch a convent or a priest was denounced as sacrilege.

In the enthusiasm of revolution and conflict the Italian provinces had come together. At bottom they were antagonistic in ideas, customs, history, and local prejudices. They had no traditions of headship or union. Distinct idioms of language emphasized their separation. How were they ever to be molded into one people?

The military system of Europe laid upon Italy a heavy burden. When the United States of America became a fact, they could dismiss their troops to civil life, because alone upon a continent and protected by 3000 miles of ocean. But the safety and the very existence of Italy depended on her immediate development and maintenance of an immense standing army. The latest arrival among the nations had to conform herself to the situation as she found it. Ages of oppression had given the people few roads or bridges or means of communication. They

had neither schools, courts, effective police, nor equitable system of raising revenue. Brigandage was a profession over a large part of the territory. Ignorant and lawless, they were generations behind the civilized world.

The king and his advisers applied themselves with patience and good sense to the organization of the kingdom. They accomplished much in every department of administration, but evils which had been growing for centuries could not be radically cured in a single reign.

By the guarantee law of May, 1871, they endeavored to regulate the relations of the papal and royal courts. They declared the person of the sovereign pontiff inviolable, decreed him sovereign honors and a military guard, assigned him an annual income of 3,225,000 francs, the possession of the Vatican, of St. John Lateranus and the villa of Castel-Gandolfo and their dependencies. They carefully left him perfect liberty in the exercise of his spiritual functions, while reaffirming that his temporal sovereignty had departed. But the Pope was willing to accept nothing from a government which he considered irreligious and anti-Christian, and once more protested solemnly against all the measures taken.

Victor Emmanuel died on January 9, 1878, at the age of fifty-eight. It is pleasant to remember that on his death-bed he received a kindly message and absolution from the Holy Father, who in that supreme hour allowed his natural tenderness as a man to triumph over his rigid dogmatism as priest. One month afterwards, at the age of eighty-six, after a pontificate of thirty-one years—the longest in papal history—the Pope followed the monarch to the tomb. The conclave of cardinals, on February 10, elected Cardinal Pecci, chamberlain of the Sacred College, to the Holy See.

**The Reign of King Humbert** (1878-1900).—Though distracted by many grave questions of domestic and foreign policy, his reign presented less general interest than his father's. Its electoral struggles were waged rather upon the personality of leaders—Depretis, Cairoli, Crispi—than upon party platforms. A leading question was that of alliances, whether Italy should follow France or

Germany. Gradually the center of influence shifted from the north to the more democratic provinces of the south. Burdens of taxation to further colonial projects and maintain an enormous army and powerful navy fell heavily upon an impoverished people. On this account frequent and tumultuous disorders broke out in the chief Italian towns. Yet there was progress in the tranquilization of the country and in the application of constitutional government and a remarkable development in education.

Italy had counted upon Tunis as a future acquisition, a sort of colonial counterpoise to the neighboring French province of Algeria. But in 1881 Tunis was seized by the French. The angry Italians were powerless. Indignation at the French and national vanity made them join Germany and Austria in the Triple Alliance. They sought for some equivalent for Tunis and believed they had found it on the western shores of the Red Sea. By holding Massowah on that sea, they imagined that all the trade of Abyssinia would flow through their hands. It was gratifying to think of sharing with the other great Powers in the spoils of Africa. Costly wars followed with the Negus of Abyssinia, but they gained the colony of Eritrea (1890), South Somali (1889), the Somali coast (1893), and Tigré (1895). Though all Abyssinia was declared an Italian protectorate (1889), the Negus Menelek continued his resistance. General Baratieri met a terrible reverse at Amba Alaghi (1895). Commandant Galliano made a heroic defense at Makallé, but on March 1, 1896, General Baratieri was crushed by the Negus at Adowa, losing all his guns and one-third of his troops. This frightful disaster caused the fall of Crispi, who had been prime minister since 1887. Finally, the humiliating treaty of Adis Abeba (October 26, 1896) closed the ill-judged and ill-advised expedition. The absolute independence of Abyssinia was recognized and almost all the Italian conquests restored.

On July 29, 1900, King Humbert was assassinated at Monza by Bresci, an Italian anarchist. The dead sovereign was entombed near his father in the church of Santa Maria Rotonda, better known as the Pantheon. The

reign of his only son and successor, Victor Emmanuel III, began at once.

**Italia Irredenta.**—All ancient Italy, as indicated by geography and extending southward from the Alps, had been brought under one scepter. Beyond those mountain barriers or inhabiting the islands of the sea were people whose language was Italian and who were claimed as belonging to the Italian family. Such were Nice, Savoy, and Corsica, occupied by France, Malta by Great Britain, and South Tyrol, Trieste, and the islands and shores of the northwestern Adriatic by Austria. To these territories in common the name of Italia Irredenta or "not emancipated Italy" is applied. To repossess or acquire them is the ambition of Italians to-day. So little is said concerning it that the idea seems to slumber, but it is no less real and deep-seated.

## AUSTRIA-HUNGARY TO 1900

**Accession of Francis Joseph** (1848).—The reign of Francis Joseph fills the history of Austria during the past fifty years. A youth of eighteen, he ascended a throne that seemed tottering to its fall. In every part of his dominions there was disorder or open rebellion. In the proclamation announcing his accession he declared, "We hope with the aid of God and in concert with our peoples to succeed in reuniting in one great state body all the countries and all the races of the monarchy." This ambition was worthy of a great sovereign. It was possible only under some form of centralized federation, which, while grouping all around a common point, left individuality to each. It was a program which every people under the monarchy except one was ready to ratify. The one dissident and opposing member in the body politic was the German minority. Accustomed to rule, it would not descend to a plane of equality with the other races, on whom it looked with the contempt of a superior. And they, proud of their traditions and confident in their strength, asked not for favors, but for

rights. As a result the agitation was smothered for a time and Austria entered upon many bleak years of pitiless reaction.

**Austrian Absolutism** (1850-1866).—Letters patent from the emperor (January 1, 1852) divided the different provinces into administrative circles and curtailed further the meager powers of the various diets. Hungary was ruled by martial law until 1854. The attempt was made to Germanize all Austrian subjects. The German language was rendered obligatory in the civil administration, the courts and schools of the Hungarians, Servians, Roumanians, Croatians, Slavonians, and Bohemians. For a Bohemian to publish a newspaper in his own language was a crime. The press was silenced and jury decisions were reversed by superior order.

In its measures of repression the government invoked the powerful coöperation of the Catholic Church. The Austrian bishops had declared "that sentiment of nationality was a relic of paganism; that difference of languages was a consequence of the original fall of man." Hence all were to be Germanized! The concordat of 1855 placed all private and public education under the control of the bishops, and allowed the circulation of no book which had met ecclesiastical censure. It gave to the high clergy the right to imprison and inflict corporal penalties on whom they pleased, and for that end put at their disposal the governmental police. Prince Schwartzenberg had died in 1852. But under Alexander Bach, minister of the interior and negotiator of the concordat, the dark ages settled down upon Austria.

In the Crimean War Austria willingly played an ignoble part. She owed to the Tsar Nicholas an eternal debt, because he had rescued her in the Hungarian revolution. But she dreaded the might of Russia and would gladly have seen her crippled. Moreover, it was her interest to uphold the authority of the Sultan over his Christian subjects. Though ostensibly on the side of Great Britain and France, her dilatory tactics and irresolution angered the allies. When, by the alliance of France and Piedmont in 1859, Austria was swept out of Lombardy, she was reaping as she had sown. Her

Bohemian and Hungarian subjects rejoiced in her reverses at Magenta and Solferino. In Bohemia the peasants said, "If we are defeated, we shall have a constitution; if we are victorious, we shall have the Inquisition."

The emperor had grown older and hence stronger and wiser. He dismissed Bach and ventured on some timid reforms (1860). Goluchowski, neither German nor Hungarian, but Polish, was called to the ministry and allowed to elaborate a partial charter. The Schmerling ministry was charged with its application. There was to be a Chamber of Nobles, named by the sovereign, and a Chamber of Deputies, named by the provincial Diets. But all was so devised as to swamp the other nationalities under the preponderance of the Germans. The scheme was a dismal failure. Venetia, Hungary, Transylvania, and Croatia refused to send their representatives. The Hungarian leader, Deák, planted himself firmly on the abrogated Hungarian constitution of 1848. The Hungarian legalists asserted that Francis Joseph was not legally their sovereign as he had never come to their country to be crowned. The emperor paid a formal visit to Pesth. He dismissed Schmerling from office and replaced him by Belcredi, a Moravian, who cared far less for the Germanization of the empire. Prague, Pesth, and Lemberg were illuminated as for victory. In Galicia they even dared to teach the Polish language in the schools. Hungary awoke to new life, and in its Diet openly demanded all the rights and privileges which the Emperor Ferdinand IV had granted.

**The Austro-Hungarian Monarchy and Political Reforms** (1866).—The Austro-Prussian War, with its catastrophe of Sadowa, was in the end a blessing to Austria. Like Antæus, she rose the stronger for having been prostrated upon the ground. Her German inhabitants, as arrogant and self-assertive as before, remained to her, but her internal and foreign policy could never again be the same. She was no longer a German state. Even the loss of Venetia, though a humiliation, increased rather than diminished her strength. As long as Austria sought her center of gravity outside herself, whether in Italy or Germany, she had defied with impunity all the aspira-

tions of her subject races and had scoffed at their historic rights. Now it was forced upon the consciousness of the most obtuse that she must revolutionize all her antecedent policy or submit to speedy dissolution. The Emperor Francis Joseph keenly realized both the imminent perils and the rich possibilities of the situation. A new order of things could never be brought about by any statesman of his dominions, identified as was each of them with some grievance or faction. With insight akin to genius he discerned the man for the hour. He invited a foreigner and a Protestant, a former minister of Saxony, the Count von Beust, to accept the chancellorship and to undertake the complete reorganization —political, financial, military—of the most devotedly Roman Catholic and hitherto the most reactionary empire in Europe.

The new chancellor treated at once with the Hungarians. The terms of the Ausgleich or agreement with Hungary were submitted by a committee of sixty-seven members of the Magyar Diet, having at their head Francis Deák, "the Franklin of Hungary," the ablest, purest, and most patriotic of her sons. Their first two proposals were, that the emperor should recognize the independent existence of Hungary by giving her a ministry of her own and should himself be crowned as her king. Count Julius Andrassy, a political exile, who had been condemned to death for his share in the revolution of 1848, was appointed Hungarian prime minister (February 18, 1867). On June 8 the coronation of Francis Joseph at Pesth as king of Hungary was celebrated with all the ancient ceremony and pomp. Twenty days later he ratified the Ausgleich. The Hungarian crown and stripe of green were added to the imperial flag, which ever since has indicated the dual monarchy.

Every feature of the new political arrangement bore a dual character. The Ausgleich itself afforded a modus vivendi, but it was as much a formula of separation as a formula of union. It was like the hyphen dividing and joining the two words in the official title, Austro-Hungarian, by which the new empire was to be known. Henceforth there was Cisleithania or "Austria," a jum-

ble of all the states and provinces supposed to be on the west of the Leitha, and Transleithania or "Hungary," another jumble of all the states and provinces on the east of that river. In each jumble there were two factors, a dominant and supercilious minority—Magyar in Hungary, German in Austria—and an overborne and refractory majority. The only cord which fastened Cisleithania and Transleithania together was possession of a common dynasty. Let that dynasty become extinct and at once they would fall apart. Affairs of foreign interest but common to the two—foreign relations, war, marine, imperial finances—were to be confided to an imperial cabinet responsible to the parliaments of the two states. Affairs of domestic common interest—coinage, customs-duties, military service, special legislation—were controlled by the delegations made up of members chosen from the two parliaments, sixty from each state, to meet alternately at Vienna and Pesth. Nor could these delegations do more than vote a temporary arrangement, a kind of contract, for ten years.

Such a system was an anomaly, a political experiment without precedent. Hungary entered upon it with her revived liberal constitution of 1848. She assumed three-tenths of the public debt. Austria likewise possessed a liberal constitution, in its present form dating from 1867. The seventeen Austrian provinces had each its Landtag or legislative body. Above them rose the Reichsrath, consisting of a house of lords and house of 203 deputies, elected by the seventeen Landtags.

Hungary was appeased. The Austrian Germans were content, but a cry of indigation and rage went up from all the other peoples of the empire. The Slavs had received nothing but wordy concessions as to education and language, which were expected to be and were afterwards evaded.

The Bohemians or Czechs had historic rights as ancient and a political entity as definite and distinct as the Magyars of Hungary. Nor were they far inferior to them in number. Count von Beust, however, was seeking not justice but expediency, and believed that, since

two races were satisfied, he could ignore the rest. Bohemia, Moravia, Carniola refused to send delegates to the Reichsrath. So skillfully had the electoral apportionments been manipulated that their abstention did not cause a deadlock, a minority of voters being represented by a quorum or majority of deputies. An ethnographic congress was then being held in Moscow (1867). It was natural that many Austrian Slavs should attend this family reunion of pan-Slavism. Their presence in the ancient metropolis of the Tsars produced a profound sensation all over Europe.

Meanwhile, the concordat with the Church was practically abrogated, civil marriage authorized, education taken from clerical control, the jury restored, the press partially emancipated, the right of public meetings guaranteed, and the army reorganized on the Prussian model. Some of these reforms became sharp-edged weapons in Slavic hands. On August 22, 1868, the Czech deputies issued their declaration. By this memorable document, which constitutes the platform of the Bohemian nation to-day, in calm and dignified language they set forth their rights and their demands. Encouraged by the emperor (September, 1871) they submitted a program, called the Fundamental Articles, which proposed autonomy for Bohemia under Francis Joseph, who was to be crowned its king. The furious outcry of the Hungarians and Germans prevented its being carried into effect. Shortly afterwards the title of chancellor was suppressed. Von Beust was succeeded as minister of foreign affairs by Count Andrassy. Thus a Hungarian had become the ministerial head of the dual empire.

The Hungarians continued to treat their Slavic and other subjects as cruelly as the Austrians in their worst days had treated them. Their conception of freedom or toleration was limited to freedom and toleration for themselves. Difference of religion inflamed the hatred of race. They regarded the Croatians, Rumanians, Servians, Slovaks, not so much as members of other nationalities, but as dissenters and heretics who must be Magyarized at any cost. Nor were they at first inclined to renew the Ausgleich with Austria when its first term

of ten years expired. In both countries local matters continued to absorb the public mind until the insurrection in Herzegovina against the Sultan and the massacres in Bulgaria roused the attention of Europe and thrust the Eastern Question again to the front.

**Acquisition of Bosnia and Herzegovina** (1878).—In 1877, after having exhausted all the resources of diplomacy to end the horrors in Bulgaria, Russia declared war against the Sultan and invaded the Ottoman Empire. The Austro-Hungarian government was involved in extreme difficulty. Its Slavic subjects sympathized keenly with their suffering brethren in Turkey and demanded coöperation with Russia. The Hungarians, blood kinsmen of the Turks, mindful of Turkish hospitality in 1849, and full of resentment against Russia, were as eager to coöperate with Turkey. General Klapka, the hero of Komorn, offered his services to the Sultan. The Turks were toasted and feasted at Pesth and the Russians at Prague. The Germans, dominant at Vienna, cared nothing for the Bulgarians. Above all, they dreaded the extension of Russian influence and territory which was certain to result from the war. But the racial condition of their empire made neutrality a necessity. To side in arms with either belligerent would rend the monarchy in twain. Yet, anxious to make the most of a difficult situation, the government intended that its enforced neutrality should be paid for. A quasi promise was obtained from the Tsar that on the conclusion of peace he would not oppose the occupation of Bosnia and Herzegovina by Austria-Hungary. The Congress of Berlin (1878) authorized Austria to occupy and administer those provinces "in the name of the Sultan." Eventual absorption into the Dual Monarchy was the plan of Austro-Hungarian statesmen. Their conquest was bloody and costly. It added to the embarrassment of the empire even more than to its territory. It introduced a population difficult to amalgamate and increased the already threatening Slavic mass.

**Austria-Hungary from 1878 to 1901.**—Count Taafe was minister-president of Austria from 1879 to 1893. An opportunist and a moderate, he endeavored to be hardly

more than a political peacemaker. His efforts in that direction met little success. So did those of the Polish Count Badeni or Baron von Gautsch or Baron von Frankenthurm or Count Thun-Hohenstein or Dr. Körber, who one after the other followed in that impossible office. During this period the Austrian, and in less degree the Hungarian, parliament, constantly presented a scene of indescribable turbulence and confusion. Yet in their babel of tongues and bedlam of factional strife, there was always something definite which the chamber or the party was seeking. What seemed mere wrangling was at bottom a serious assertion of principles, true or false, and a vindication or denial of rights. The Ausgleich terminated in 1897, and was not formally renewed. The personality of the emperor has become even more than formerly the one point of contact in the dual empire. The assassination at Geneva (September 10, 1898) of the Empress Elizabeth by an Italian anarchist was mourned no less in Hungary than in Austria.

In October, 1895, Count Goluchowski, a Pole, became the minister of foreign affairs. To him more than to any other statesman was due the policy of concert, followed by the six great Powers in reference to the Armenian, Cretan, and Greek questions of 1895-1897.

## RUSSIA FROM 1825 TO 1900

**Nicholas I** (1825-1855).—As ruler of Russia the Tsar Nicholas during his reign of thirty years exercised a threefold influence upon European politics. First, as heir, not only to the victorious empire, but to the ideas of his brother, Alexander I, he was the acknowledged head of the absolutist or reactionary party throughout Europe. Second, as sovereign of the largest Slavic state, he was the hope of an awakening pan-Slavism, that should reunite Slavic tribes. The overthrow and absorption of Poland, the second largest Slavic state, after an intermittent warfare of centuries between her and Russia, was congenial to the other Slavs. It was among

the western states that she found most sympathizers and not among peoples of the same blood. Third, as sovereign of the empire of orthodoxy, he was regarded, and regarded himself, as of right the protector and champion of his coreligionists, subjects of other rulers, especially of the Greek Orthodox Christians, subjects of the Sultan of Turkey.

This presumed right of a Russian Tsar had been recognized by treaties, such as those of Kaïnardji (1774), Yassi (1792), Adrianople (1829), and Hunkiar Iskelessi (1833), with the Ottoman Empire. In this respect Nicholas was the legitimate successor of Peter the Great. Yet unlike Peter he detested Western civilization. A young man of eighteen at the time of the French invasion, the horrors and the triumph of that gigantic struggle were burned into his soul. Russia unaided had then annihilated the hosts of the hitherto invincible Napoleon. It is not strange if Nicholas thought that Russia could withstand the world. By his accession in 1825, just a century after the death of the great Tsar, the Muscovite Empire, for the first time in a hundred years, had a sovereign who was wholly Russian at heart and who believed only in Russia. The Russians adored him with such loyalty as no other ruler of the house of Romanoff had received. His unlooked-for advent to the throne was regarded as the special interposition of Providence. His brother, Constantine, seventeen years his senior, was the natural heir of Alexander I. But Constantine in 1820 had become devotedly attached to the Polish Countess Groudsinska. He could marry her only on condition of renouncing his rights of inheritance. He preferred the hand of the lady to the crown of Russia.

**The Crimean War** (1853-1856).—Its apparent cause was a contention between Greek Orthodox and Latin priests as to the custody of certain holy places in Jerusalem (1851). The former were supported by Russia and the latter by France and Austria. A mixed commission to examine the matter was appointed by Sultan Abd-ul Medjid, which, while giving a temperate report, on the whole favored the Latins. The Russians and

the Greek Orthodox rayahs of Turkey were indignant at the decision. It was a general Eastern superstition that the year 1853, which completed four centuries from the capture of Constantinople, would see the downfall of the Ottoman Empire. The Tsar believed all things were propitious to hasten that event.

He held two secret interviews (January 9 and 14, 1853) with Sir Hamilton Seymour, the British ambassador at St. Petersburg, wherein he spoke without reserve and asked the coöperation of Great Britain. He proposed to unite the Danubian provinces of Moldavia and Wallachia into an independent state under the protection of Russia, and create two states of Servia and Bulgaria. He said nothing definite about Constantinople, but offered Crete and Egypt to Great Britain. It is interesting to remark that, with the exception of Crete, whose destiny is still undecided, the other propositions of the Tsar have become facts. "If we agree," he said, "I care little what the others"—France and Austria—"may do." The British ambassador shrewdly made public all that had been said to him in confidence. "The others" were enraged at the small account taken of them rather than at the propositions.

In May, 1853, Prince Mentchikoff was sent to Constantinople with a peremptory note, demanding that the complaints of Russian pilgrims to the Holy Land receive satisfaction and that guarantees be given for the protection of the Greek Orthodox Christians in the Ottoman Empire. Lord Stratford de Redcliffe, British ambassador to the Porte from 1842 to 1858, encouraged the Sultan to refuse compliance. The Russian armies crossed the Pruth and occupied the principalities. To avert war the Austrian government drew up the "Vienna Note," which was approved by France and Great Britain and accepted by Russia. But the British ambassador at Constantinople secured its rejection by the Sultan and persuaded him to take resolute action. The Porte delivered an ultimatum to Russia (September 26) and declared war (October 4).

The subsequent events of the struggle and its conclu-

sion in the Treaty of Paris are narrated in the chapter on the "Second French Empire." Nicholas had been outwitted in diplomacy and defeated in arms. Broken-hearted and disillusioned, even before the capture of Sebastopol, the "iron emperor" gave way. Sick and suffering, he committed imprudences which can only be explained as a desire to hasten his end. He himself dictated the dispatch which he sent to all the great cities of Russia, "The emperor is dying," and expired on March 2, 1855.

The disasters of the Crimea had been a cruel revelation, not only to him but to his subjects. His army and his people had supposed they were to revolutionize the East, indefinitely extend their empire, and drive out the crescent from Jerusalem. Instead, they were obliged to dismantle their own fortresses and withdraw their warships from the Black Sea.

**Alexander II** (1855-1881).—"Your burden will be heavy," his father had said to him when dying. To bear this burden nature had well fitted the new Tsar. Though devoted to his father's memory, he realized that his father's system had been found wanting and that another epoch must open in Russia. Everywhere there was the sullen rumble of discontent. Of mediocre ability, self-distrustful rather than headstrong, just, patient, and plodding, he desired to inaugurate a new era. He determined to reform where it was possible and to mitigate what he could not reform. In his manifesto immediately after the conclusion of peace he outlined his policy almost with boldness. The corruption and inefficiency of administration had been protected by a muzzled press, by a rigorous police, and by a compulsory silence on the part of the people. He encouraged freedom of speech and thought. "The conservative Russia of Nicholas I seemed buried under the sod. Everyone declared himself a liberal." Public opinion wished to undertake every reform at once, but the question of social reform dominated all others.

There were then 47,200,000 serfs, divided into two great classes. Of these 24,700,000, dependent upon the crown, enjoyed a large degree of personal freedom.

They exercised local self-government, administered their own affairs in communes, or mirs, by an elected council, and possessed tribunals which they had themselves chosen. The prohibition to dispose of or acquire property and to remove from the place of birth was abolished by successive ukases, beginning July, 1858.

The other 22,500,000 serfs, the "disposition" of 120,000 nobles, were hardly better than slaves. The system had grown up strangely when Russia was bowed under the Tartar yoke, but it had been introduced by native princes and not by foreigners. Gradually the preceding Tsars or dukes of Moscow had imposed their absolute will on their vassals, the nobles, and the nobles had succeeded in doing the same to their vassals, the peasants or serfs, only more effectually. These aristocratic usurpations had been even confirmed and the mujik still further restricted by successive ukases during two centuries. Alexander I and Nicholas I himself had vainly tried to modify the iniquitous system. Innumerable difficulties stood in the way. Who should indemnify the proprietors for their loss? What was the advantage of freedom to emancipated serfs who could possess nothing of their own?

In March, 1856, Alexander II invited his "faithful nobility" to consider what steps were necessary to bring about emancipation. His suggestions were coldly received. He traveled over the country, appealing to the nobles to assist him, but their inertia was harder to overcome than active opposition. Finally, he issued his immortal edict of emancipation (March 3, 1861). Thus by a stroke of the pen, the serfs, hitherto fastened to the soil, were raised to the rank of freemen. Provision was made for their acquiring property and for the protection of their newly granted liberty. But a change so radical was accompanied by many local disturbances and a good deal of bloodshed.

An annual statement of the public finances began to be made. The universities were delivered from the restrictions imposed by Nicholas. Foreigners acquired the same rights as were enjoyed by Russians abroad. Cen-

sorship of the press had been already relaxed. The use of the knout was abolished. Such Jews as exercised any manual occupation received permission to settle freely in the empire.

Reforms were likewise introduced into the administration of Poland. But the spirit of nationality was not extinct and nothing less than independence could satisfy the Poles. Further concessions accomplished little. The troubles went on increasing until January, 1863, when they took the form of guerilla warfare. Then open rebellion broke out. Resistance was cruelly put down. The insurrection cost Poland dearly. Despite prodigies of valor on the part of her devoted sons, the last remnants of her national life were stamped out. Polish was replaced by Russian as the official language and was forbidden in the schools. Ardent Slavophils wished likewise to Russify Finland, but the Tsar confirmed all its political privileges. Livonia, Esthonia, and Courland were not disquieted but continued to exist as vassal provinces, with their own language and laws, under the Russian crown.

Meanwhile the war in America was going on for the preservation of the Union. Russia was pronounced and outspoken in friendliness to the United States. The firm and consistent course pursued by her, when other Powers were desirous of our national dissolution, is something which Americans cannot forget.

**Revision of the Treaty of Paris** (1871).—In 1870 Prince Gortschakoff, the Russian chancellor, informed the European Powers that Russia no longer considered herself bound by the Treaty of Paris as far as it curtailed her natural rights on the Black Sea. Various infractions of that treaty were assigned as reasons for this declaration. A conference of the signatory states at London accepted the declaration of Russia. Thus the most important result of the Crimean War was annulled. Russia has since been free to construct such fortifications as she pleased upon the shores of the Black Sea and to maintain a navy upon its waters. This right was furthermore ratified by an agreement with Turkey (March 18, 1872).

**The Russo-Turkish War** (1877-1878).—The promises of the Sultan to introduce reform in the treatment of his Christian subjects had been flagrantly and constantly broken. Protected by the Treaty of Paris, wherein the Powers had waived all right to interfere in the internal affairs of the Ottoman Empire, the Turks were no longer influenced by the restraint of fear. In 1874 the Slavic rayahs of Bosnia and Herzegovina rebelled. Again the Sultan promised reforms, but the insurgents demanded guarantees that he would keep his word. To prevent the flames of insurrection from spreading, Count Andrassy, the Austro-Hungarian chancellor, obtained the Sultan's approval to certain measures enumerated in a formal note (February 12, 1876), but the insurgents were still distrustful. Suddenly the consuls of Germany and France at Salonica were massacred by a Mussulman mob. Russia, Germany, and Austria united in the memorandum of Berlin (May 1), demanding of the Sultan a two months' armistice with the Bosnians and Herzegovinians and immediate introduction of the reforms. They threatened the employment of force in case of refusal. Encouraged by the support of Great Britain, who refused to approve the memorandum, the Sultan withheld his consent.

The horrors of Bulgaria broke out, where more than 20,000 Bulgarians were massacred. Public meetings in Great Britain denounced the atrocities. Servia and Montenegro took up arms. The latter was victorious. The former was totally defeated, though the Servian army contained many Russian volunteers and was commanded by the Russian General Tchernaïeff. Alexander II and the Russian official party wished to avoid war, though the Tsar in a speech at Moscow (November 12) openly expressed his sympathy for the Christians. France and Germany held themselves aloof. Austria did her utmost to preserve peace. Great Britain proposed a conference of the Powers at Constantinople, which met on November 23. It presented an ultimatum, requiring the autonomy of Bosnia, Herzegovina, and Bulgaria, concessions of territory to Montenegro, the status quo for Servia, a general amnesty, genuine re-

form in Turkish administration and judiciary, and the nomination by the great Powers of two commissions to see that the promises were carried out. In case of refusal all the ambassadors were to demand their passports. Sultan Abd-ul Hamid II was on the throne, his predecessors, Sultan Abdul Aziz and Sultan Murad V, having been overthrown that same year by revolution. The astute Midhat Pasha was grand vizier. Again encouraged by the British ambassador, the Sultan refused to comply.

No Power was willing to act, though the ambassadors in a body had formally left Constantinople. Midhat Pasha signed a treaty with Servia, but Montenegro held out. Prince Gortschakoff sent a circular note to the European courts (January 31) and General Ignatieff, the Russian ambassador, traveled over Europe to induce united action. The protocol of London (March 31) invited the Sultan to disarm, and announced that if he continued to violate his promises of reform the great Powers would consult further.

Nothing had been accomplished. The resources of a diplomacy of words were exhausted. Turkey was still indifferent or defiant. In Russia the Tsar and the official classes still hesitated, but the Russian people were aflame. Public sentiment, even in a despotic empire, could not be resisted. The same forces of humanity and sympathy which compelled the American government to take up arms in the effort to end the horrors in Cuba, compelled the reluctant Tsar to take up arms to end longer-continued and more atrocious horrors in the dominions of the Sultan. The Russian war of 1877-1878 against Turkey finds its exact parallel in the American war of 1898 against Spain. Both were spontaneous armed uprisings in behalf of mankind.

The Tsar issued his manifesto on April 24, 1877. The war lasted until the preliminary treaty of San Stefano on March 3, 1878. It was carried on in both Asia and Europe.

In Asia the Russian general-in-chief, the Armenian Loris Melikoff, captured Ardahan (May 17). General Der Hougassoff, also an Armenian, took Bayezid (April

20) and gained the battles of Dram Dagh (June 10) and Daïar (June 21). Melikoff, defeated at Zewin (June 26) by Mouktar Pasha, was obliged to retreat. The Russians received reënforcements. Mouktar Pasha was crushed at Aladja Dagh (October 14-16) and driven into Erzeroum. Kars was stormed (November 18) and fell with 17,000 prisoners and 300 cannon. The road to Constantinople through Asia Minor was open.

In Europe Abd-ul Kerim Pasha, Turkish commander-in-chief, remained apathetic in his camp at Shumla. The main Russian army crossed the Danube at Sistova (June 27). Baron von Krüdener took Nicopolis with 7000 prisoners, 113 cannon, and two monitors (July 15). General Gurko attacked the Turks in the Balkans and seized the Shipka Pass (July 17-19). Panic reigned at Constantinople. The Ottoman Minister of War, Redif Pasha, who had proclaimed the Holy War, was removed. Abd-ul Kerim Pasha was replaced by Mehemet Ali Pasha, the son of a German tailor converted to Islam. Suliman Pasha was recalled from Montenegro to protect the capital. Jealousy prevented cooperation among the Ottoman generals. Suliman Pasha dashed his army against the Russians and the Bulgarian legion in vain attempts to regain the Shipka Pass (August 16 and September 17). Mehemet Ali Pasha was terribly defeated at Tserkoria (September 21). Osman Pasha was forced into Plevna (August 31). There he defended himself with skill and bravery. But his capitulation was only a question of time. General Todleben, who had fortified Sebastopol in the Crimean War, took charge of the siege. Skobeleff and Gurko cut off all communication. The Rumanians, who had declared themselves independent and had joined the Russians with 60,000 men, performed prodigies of valor. By a general sortie Osman Pasha tried to break through the iron circle, but was forced to surrender with 43,000 soldiers (December 10). The siege had lasted almost four months. The Sultan now wished to treat for peace, but was persuaded by the British ambassador, Sir Austin Layard, to continue the war. Suliman Pasha replaced

Mehemet Ali Pasha and gained a tardy victory at Elena (November 20).

The famous Turkish quadrilateral of Silistria, Rustchuk, Shumla, and Varna was still intact. Already the mountain passes were blocked with snow. An unusually severe season had begun. The Turks supposed that hostilities would cease until spring. The Grand Duke Nicholas ordered General Gurko to force the Balkans. Then followed a magnificent winter campaign along ravines and precipices, where the soldiers themselves dragged the cannon. The astounded Turks were everywhere defeated. Sofia, the Bulgarian capital, which had not seen a Christian army for 400 years, was entered (January 3, 1878). Six days later Wessir Pasha surrendered with 32,000 men and sixty-six cannon.

The Ottoman Empire seemed entering upon its death agony. The Servians had declared war. Thessaly, Macedonia, and Albania were in open rebellion. The Cretans were tumultuously demanding union with Greece. The Greek army crossed the frontier. The Montenegrins captured fortress after fortress in the west. The Russians effected their junction at Adrianople (January 20) and reached the Marmora on January 31. That same day an armistice was signed at Adrianople. It was time. To oppose the advance of the invaders the Sultan had only a corps of 12,000 men, camped on the hills of Tchataldja, an easy day's march from the capital.

The rapid Russian successes produced intense excitement in Great Britain. The government made vigorous preparations for war. The British fleet passed the Dardanelles and anchored close to Constantinople (February 14). Thereupon the Grand Duke Nicholas advanced to San Stefano, seven miles from the city walls.

On March 3 the Russian and Ottoman plenipotentiaries signed the preliminary treaty of San Stefano. It recognized the independence of both Rumania and Servia. The latter was enlarged by the district of Nisch. The former received the Dobroudja in exchange for Bessarabia, which was restored to Russia as before the Crimean War. Montenegro gained the ports of Spizza

and Antivari on the Adriatic and more than doubled its territory. In Asia Russia was confirmed in the possession of the eastern quadrilateral, Kars, Ardahan, Bayezid, and Batum. The Turks were condemned to pay a war indemnity of 300,000,000 roubles. Bulgaria was created a vassal principality of the Sultan. It was to extend from the Danube to the Ægean Sea, thus cutting in twain the still remaining Turkish possessions in Europe. Never had the Ottoman Empire signed a treaty so fatal.

**The Congress of Berlin** (1878).—The preliminary treaty of San Stefano terrified Austria, who saw aggrandized Slavic states on her southwest frontier neighboring upon her own Slavic peoples. It enraged Great Britain, who saw in it the practical extinction of the Ottoman Empire. But Austria was held in check by Germany. Great Britain, though unable to put a large army into the field, employed every weapon known to diplomacy. Russia was neither desirous of nor prepared for further war. After much negotiation with the courts of Great Britain and Germany, she agreed to submit the treaty to a congress of the Powers at Berlin. A secret agreement however had just been arrived at for their two governments by Count Schouvaloff and Lord Salisbury.

The congress opened on June 13 and continued in session just one month. The nations were represented by their ablest and most illustrious statesmen. Among the delegates were Count Andrassy, Austro-Hungarian Minister of Foreign Affairs, Monsieur Waddington from France, Count Corti from Italy, Mehemet Ali Pasha, and Caratheodoridi Pasha from Turkey, Lord Salisbury from Great Britain, and Count Schouvaloff from Russia. The three most conspicuous figures were Prince Bismarck, who presided, Prince Gortschakoff, chancellor of Russia, and Lord Beaconsfield, prime minister of Great Britain.

The Treaty of Berlin much reduced the size of the proposed Bulgaria. It also divided it in two: "Principality of Bulgaria," between the Danube and the Balkans, an autonomous state tributary to the Sultan; "Province of Eastern Rumelia," extending south of

the Balkans halfway to the Ægean Sea. The latter, though under a Christian governor, was to depend directly upon the Sultan. The independence of Rumania and Servia was recognized, but, as in the case of the always independent Montenegro, their proposed acquisitions were diminished. Bosnia and Herzegovina were assigned to Austria. The wish was expressed, though not inserted in the treaty, that the Sultan make certain concessions of territory to the Greeks. As to the Christian subjects of the Sultan, the congress contented itself with a repetition of his familiar promises to introduce reforms. In Asia Khotour was ceded to Persia, and the Russians restored Bayezid to Turkey, though retaining Kars, Batum, and Ardahan.

During the session the revelation was made of a secret treaty for defensive alliance between Great Britain and Turkey, which had been concluded on the preceding 4th of June. In this secret treaty Great Britain agreed to unite in arms with the Sultan in defense of the Ottoman Empire in case it should ever be attacked by Russia. In return the Sultan promised to assign the island of Cyprus to Great Britain and to introduce the necessary reforms in the treatment of his Christian subjects—such reforms to be determined later by the two Powers.

The Congress of Berlin, not only in the very fact of its existence but in its decisions, was a diplomatic defeat for Russia. Her main object, the deliverance of Bulgaria, was indeed attained, but this Bulgaria was torn asunder and shorn of its strength. Great Britain and Austria without fighting had gained: the one, Cyprus and preponderance in Asia Minor; and the other, Bosnia and Herzegovina, advancement on the road to Salonica, and hence direct influence over Montenegro and Servia. The Turkish Empire had been rescued from destruction, its existence prolonged, and further opportunity afforded for future outrage and massacre. For Beaconsfield and Great Britain that congress was a striking but none the less a deplorable triumph.

**The Nihilists.**—The reforms after the accession of Alexander II had come upon the people like a galvanic shock. However warmly, though vaguely, desired, their

application caused everywhere dissatisfaction. The ingrained despotic system had vitiated every activity of life. The serfs were dissatisfied because they had not gained more. The nobles were sullen because, when dispossessed of their serfs, their revenues were curtailed. The hosts of students from the humbler classes, attracted by scholarships or purses to the universities and newly opened colleges, found on completion of their studies that all the civil and official positions were already occupied by the privileged and themselves shut out. Everywhere there was discontent.

The irresolute Tsar was discouraged. Some proposed reforms he withheld and others he partially withdrew. The government tried to relax and tighten the reins at the same time. Reaction set in, and the counter reaction was nihilism. Russian nihilism could resemble the mad vagaries of no other country, for it was stamped with the peculiarities of the Russian mind. Though the nihilist considered Russia diseased, he looked upon all other lands as equally or still more rotten. In Russia he saw nothing worth the keeping, and in the rest of the world he saw nothing worth the taking. Some of the nihilists were theorists and dreamers. Others, the more daring and dangerous, were revolutionists. Their ranks were recruited by men and women from the universities, who were maddened by enforced idleness and poverty and social wrongs. Never numerous, their almost inhuman activity multiplied their numbers in common opinion. Their contempt for death gave them horrible efficiency. Tracked and hunted like wild beasts, they surpassed wild beasts in merciless ferocity. For years Russia was mined and countermined by them and their terrible antagonists, the secret police of the dreaded Third Section.

Assassinations and attempts at assassination followed fast. Matvéeff, rector of the university of Kiev, Mezentseff, chief of the Third Section, Prince Krapotkine, governor of Kharkof, Colonel Knoop at Odessa, Captain Reinstein at Moscow, Pietrovski, chief of police at Archangel, and scores of prominent persons were stabbed or shot. An attempt was made to blow up the imperial

family with dynamite at the winter palace (1880). The explosion killed sixty soldiers and wounded forty. The Tsaritsa died in June, 1880. The nihilists matured their plans to blow up the bridge over which the funeral cortège was to pass and destroy the imperial hearse with all the mourners, the foreign princes and guards. A sudden storm so swelled the waters of the Neva as to prevent the execution of the plot.

On December 4, 1879, the Nihilist Executive Committee sent the Tsar his sentence of death, but for a long time every effort to put it in execution failed. In February, 1881, he submitted the scheme of a constitution to a council. On March 9 he gave the elaborated form his approval, but, hesitating still, delayed its proclamation. On the morning of March 13 he sent the order for its publication in the official messenger. That afternoon, while riding, a bomb was thrown against his carriage. Many soldiers and pedestrians were killed, but the emperor was unharmed. "Let me see the wounded," he exclaimed, and sprang from his carriage. Instantly a second bomb was thrown at him. Horribly mutilated, he was borne to his palace, where he expired without uttering a word.

In 1861 he had emancipated the serfs. In 1878 he had freed Bulgaria. At the moment of his death the constitution which he had granted was being set in type. It is a strange and sad coincidence that the two liberators, the president who freed the slaves in the United States and the Tsar who freed the serfs in Russia, should both perish by the hand of an assassin.

**Reign of Alexander III** (1881-1894).—Alexander III had to choose between two roads. Should he follow the progressive policy of his father and confirm the still unpublished constitution, or should he set his face backward and reign like Nicholas I? "Change none of my father's orders," he said at first. "It"—the constitution—"shall be his last will and testament." Unhappily for Russia such sentiments did not last. In Pobiédonostseff, High Procurator of the Holy Synod, a reactionary fanatic of spotless integrity, and the Slavophil, General Ignatieff, he found congenial counselors. The

constitution was withheld. The temperate and humane General Melikoff, the trusted friend of his father, tendered his resignation. General Ignatieff was made Minister of the Interior.

The day of absolutism, espionage, and Russification by force had come back. The government endeavored in domestic affairs to undo all that Alexander II had done. Hatred of everything foreign was the mode. Katkoff, the violent editor of the *Moscow Gazette,* was allowed the utmost latitude, because he so fully expressed all the dynastic and popular passions of the hour. Never was Russian intolerance manifested in more annoying ways and with greater severity. The treatment of the Jews was a disgrace to humanity. They were forbidden to own or lease land or to exercise any liberal profession. They were ordered to concentrate in a few western provinces so as to be more easily watched. More than 300,000 emigrated. The Lutherans and Dissenters were treated unmercifully. At last even General Ignatieff was shocked or alarmed, and proposed moderation.

Prince Gortschakoff, at the age of eighty-two, asked to be relieved from his duties as chancellor (1882). As his successor the war party desired General Ignatieff, the peace party M. de Giers. Despite its antipathy for Europe, the foreign policy of the government was pacific. M. de Giers was appointed. His rival, in chagrin, withdrew to private life. Count Tolstoï was made Minister of the Interior and under him the anti-Semitic agitation was sternly repressed. Improvement in the public finances, brought about by Vishnegradzy, the Minister of Finance, is almost the only alleviation in this dismal reign.

The nihilists, boastful of their success in " removing " a Tsar, continued their work. They held Russia in such terrorism that the coronation of Alexander III had been postponed almost two years. The Tsar had distinguished himself as a soldier in the Russo-Turkish war, but his life on the throne was passed in constant fear of assassination. Immediately on accession he had appointed his brother, Vladimir, to serve as regent in case of necessity. Ceaseless watchfulness and dread sapped his

strength. The long illness from which he finally died (October 31, 1894) was largely due to the incessant attempts of the nihilists upon his life.

**Nicholas II** (1894—).—Though at first apparently desirous of following in his father's steps, he soon showed himself awake to the spirit of the age. On November 27 at St. Petersburg he married the Princess Alix of Hesse, granddaughter of Queen Victoria. All the troops and police were withdrawn from the streets. The people were allowed without restraint to climb the lamp-posts and trees and crowd the windows along the route of the bridal procession. Such freedom on such an occasion had never been known in Russia. This manifest confidence in his subjects made a profound impression and won him immense popularity. In the formal visits of the imperial consorts to different parts of the empire the same shrewd etiquette of confidence has been followed.

On the death of M. de Giers (January, 1895), who had been the real director of Russian foreign policy since the Treaty of Berlin, Prince Lobanoff became Minister of Foreign Affairs and proved himself equally pacific. The serious Pamir difficulty as to the boundary between the British and Russian Asiatic possessions was settled in a manner honorable to both countries.

The splendor of the coronation ceremonies at Moscow (May 20, 1896) was darkened by a terrible catastrophe. Over 400,000 people had crowded together on the Khodynskoye plain to feast as guests of the Tsar. The police present, were not numerous enough to control the immense mass. In the crush over 3000 persons were suffocated or trampled to death. In his coronation manifesto the Tsar announced that the land tax was diminished one-half and that a comprehensive amnesty had been granted to political offenders. Soon afterward Nicholas II and the Tsaritsa visited Austria-Hungary, Great Britain, France, and Germany.

In 1897 the Tsar was received with enthusiasm at Warsaw. As a token of his appreciation he granted permission for the erection of a statue to Mickievitch, the patriot poet whose songs had inspired the Poles in their former resistance to Russia. In the same year, for the

first time, a general census of the empire was undertaken. When Count Lobanoff died he was succeeded as Foreign Minister by Count Mouravieff.

On August 28, 1898, the Russian government communicated to the foreign Powers one of the most memorable state papers ever issued. This document set forth in graphic language the terrible burden imposed by the existence of vast standing armies and by national rivalry in military armaments. It declared that "the supreme duty imposed to-day upon all states" is "to put an end to these incessant armaments." In dignified terms, such as only a mighty empire fearing no superior could use, it proposed a conference of all the Powers "to occupy itself with this grave problem of universal peace." In response to a formal invitation, delegates from the twenty-four chief nations of the world met in a Peace Conference at The Hague on May 18, 1899. M. de Stael, a Russian diplomat, presided. The discussions touched on many matters connected with war. The most spectacular result of the deliberations was a proposed scheme for universal arbitration.

## THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE

**The "Sacred Proclamation" of Ottoman Reforms** (1839).—Two days after the battle of Nezib, while the victorious Egyptians were marching upon Constantinople, Sultan Mahmoud died. Only the interference of the European Powers checked their advance and preserved the throne to his son, Sultan Abd-ul Medjid. Though failing in almost every enterprise he undertook, Mahmoud had made earnest efforts to reform the empire. His successor inherited his ideas. At the summer palace of Ghul Khaneh, in the presence of the foreign diplomatic body, of the heads of the various subject churches, of deputations from all the guilds, and of the great dignitaries, ecclesiastical, military, and civil, of the Ottoman state, his Hatti Sherif, or Sacred Proclamation, was read by the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Reshid Pasha

(November 3, 1839). Everything was done to give solemnity and a binding character to this rescript. It concluded with a prayer and an imprecation, and the vast assembly of Moslems, Christians, and Jews responded "Amen."

This was the first formal acknowledgment of abuses and the first official declaration of a purpose to reform that was ever made by an Ottoman sovereign. It guaranteed security of life, property, and honor to all subjects of the empire, a uniform and just taxation, and uniformity in conscription and military service. It suppressed monopolies, pronounced that all court trials be public, removed restrictions from the sale and purchase of real estate, and ordered that the property of criminals be no longer confiscated but handed over to their natural heirs. These measures were aimed at correcting those violations of justice from which Christians and Mussulmans suffered in common. Its most important provision declared that henceforth Mussulman and Christian subjects should be equal before the law. Hitherto the theory and practice since the foundation of the empire had been flagrant inequality between the adherents of the two religions.

**Massacres in the Lebanon** (1845).—The Sultan, well meaning but feeble, made only desultory efforts to put his proclamation into effect. In most localities it remained a dead letter. In others it stirred up the Moslems to prove that there had been no change in the old order. The region of Lebanon was inhabited by many religious sects. Among the more powerful were the Catholic Maronites, who enjoyed the protection of France, and the Druses, a wild tribe of heretical Mussulmans, followers of the mad Caliph Hakim. Under their leader, the Sheik Abou Naked, the Druses made a sudden attack. His followers had strict orders to harm only the Catholics, for then as always there was method in a Mussulman massacre. Every conceivable horror marked the passage of the bandit chief. He spared neither sex nor age. The government forbade the Maronites to defend themselves, but told them to trust in the padishah. The Turkish soldiers, sent to preserve

order, remained inactive or openly sided with the Druses. The French missionary stations were destroyed, their churches and convents sacked, and priests murdered. M. Guizot, then prime minister of France, dared not interfere. The French ambassador at Constantinople, M. de Bourqueney, was bolder. He sent a peremptory message to the Porte. The massacres ceased. New measures for the administration of the Lebanon were introduced and a degree of tranquillity was restored.

**Question of the Holy Places. The Crimean War** (1853-1856).—This subject has been sufficiently discussed in the chapters on the second French empire and Russia. Save at its beginning the Turks played an insignificant and humiliating part in the war. Their assistance seemed as much disdained by the British and French troops as their resistance had been by the Russians. Before the arrival of their allies the Ottoman commander-in-chief, Omar Pasha, a Christian renegade, had shown ability on the Danube. The successful defense of Silistria, where six assaults of the Russian army were repulsed, was honorable to Turkish arms. In signing the offensive and defensive treaty with Great Britain and France, the Porte promised to accomplish the following reforms: "Equality before the law and eligibility to all offices of all Ottoman subjects without distinction of religion; admission of Christian testimony in court; establishment of mixed tribunals; abolition of the kharadj or exemption tax."

**The Hatti Humayoun** (1856).—The Hatti Sherif of Ghul Khaneh had proved abortive. The abyss still yawned unbridged between the Mussulmans and the Christians. Language can hardly set forth the sense of superiority among the former. A Hatti Humayoun, or Imperial Proclamation, was issued on February 18, 1856. It reaffirmed and extended all the glittering generalities of the Hatti Sherif. It forbade all distinction between the followers of the two religions. All Christian subjects had hitherto been excluded from the ranks in the army. It now opened to them not only military service, but attainment of the highest grades. To this provision Mussulmans and Christians united in

opposition. The former were unwilling to obey officers of the subject Christian nationalities or to serve with them in the troops. The latter preferred still to pay the exemption tax and had no wish to fight for a government they abhorred.

**Massacres at Djeddah** (1858) **and in Syria** (1860). **European Intervention.**—It is a peculiar fact that the Crimean War stimulated the hatred of the Turks for all foreign Christians, for the British and French even more than for the Russians. Their pride was stung on seeing the crushing superiority in the civilization and power of the Western nations.

At Djeddah, in Arabia (July 15, 1858), the wild exhortations of some dervishes excited a crowd of pilgrims to attack the foreigners. The consul of France and viceconsul of Great Britain were massacred while trying to protect their countrymen. The bombardment of the city by an Anglo-French squadron (July 25) and the hanging of ten of the murderers made only a slight impression.

An explosion followed on a larger scale in Syria. The Druses, though comparatively quiet since 1845, were no less envenomed againt the Christians. Khurshid Pasha, governor-general of Beïrut, and Achmet Pasha, commander of the army of Arabistan, encouraged them to action. Speedily (May, 1860) the Lebanon and the neighboring country were drenched with blood. Greed and lust multiplied the bands of the fanatics. With every attendant horror entire villages were blotted out. The Bedouins of the desert joined hands with the Druses of the mountain. Damascus was as sanguinary as the Lebanon. Only the British and Prussian consulates were respected. The Ottoman troops were not behind in murder and pillage. It is impossible to tell how many thousands were slain or died of exposure. The Emir Abd-el-Kader, who for sixteen years had defended his country of Algeria against the French, was then living in Damascus. At peril of his life, with a band of followers, he protected as many Christian fugitives as he could and lavished his resources in their support.

Europe shuddered at these atrocities. Lord Palmerston denounced them in Parliament. By a convention between Great Britain and France, which the Porte was obliged to approve, 6000 French troops were sent to Syria. They were potent arguments in favor of justice and order. Fuad Pasha, Ottoman Minister of Foreign Affairs, was given full authority to punish the criminals. Marshal Achmet Pasha was tried and shot. Khurshid Pasha was condemned to prison. Eighty-five Mussulmans on conviction were put to death. Such interference was effectual. The Lebanon became, and has continued to be, one of the most orderly and peaceful provinces of the empire. By decision of the great Powers it has since been ruled by a Christian governor.

**Sultan Abd-ul Aziz** (1861-1876).—Sultan Abd-ul Medjid died in June, 1861. His reign of twenty-two years was filled with good intentions without accomplishment. His brother, Sultan Abd-ul Aziz, who succeeded, was of stronger fiber. But, kept in extreme seclusion, constantly under watch, he was as ignorant as a child of what went on in the Ottoman Empire or the outer world. On his accession he repeated all the customary glowing promises of reform. More extravagant even than his brother, his prodigality bordered on madness. Enormous sums were squandered in erecting palaces, of which he often tired before they were complete. His harem of 900 women was served by 3000 attendants. Mustapha Fazyl Pasha, accountant general, in an interview with the Sultan hinted at the danger of national bankruptcy. He was exiled for his rashness. The machinery of government was kept in motion by two capable men, Fuad Pasha and Ali Pasha. The latter was one of the ablest statesmen Turkey ever produced. Strictly honest, inaccessible to a bribe, he was moreover a tireless worker. Provincial rebellions and petty wars kept him constantly busy.

**The Insurrection of Crete** (1866-1868).—For sixty years insurrection had been the chronic condition of Crete. In 1866, as before in 1821, in 1841 and 1858, it assumed a more general and threatening form. Never were the 200,000 Christians, who formed two-thirds of

the population, more cruelly and more unjustly governed. Their complaints to Constantinople against their inhuman governor, Ismaïl Pasha, had only called out vague promises of improvement and a stern menace that they must submit to the officers of the Sultan. The Cretans got together a general assembly which declared them independent and pronounced for union with Greece. In the mountains of Sphakia, the western part of the island which never had been thoroughly subdued, they carried on a guerilla war. They routed detachment after detachment sent against them, forced the capitulation of Ismaïl Pasha, and destroyed another Turkish division at Selino. Kiritli Pasha was sent as a dictator with 40,000 men. He fared no better, nor did Omar Pasha, the Turkish generalissimo, who replaced him. France, Italy, Prussia, and Russia proposed the appointment of an international commission to administer the island. Great Britain and Austria opposed the proposition, and it was rejected by the Sultan. War seemed imminent between Turkey and Greece, but the latter power was kept from action by France and Great Britain. From America generous sums were sent to relieve the distress among the Cretan refugees, but Europe looked on in general apathy. By the employment of all its resources the Ottoman Empire at last quieted the insurrection for a time. At the convent of Arcadion the Cretans made their final stand. As the Turks crossed the last trench over the bodies of its last defenders, the Cretan women set fire to the powder in the vaults and blew up themselves and their conquerors.

**Opening of the Suez Canal** (November 17, 1869).—This year the great enterprise of M. de Lesseps, though still incomplete, was so far advanced as to be passable by ships. Its various stages of construction had already occupied twenty years. By connecting the Red Sea and the Mediterranean, it converted Africa into the vastest of the island continents. In prolonging its entire length 100 miles, over 80,000,000 cubic yards of earth and rock had been removed. About $95,000,000 had been expended on it. The only share of Turkey in the achievement was found in the fact that Ismaïl Pasha, viceroy of

Egypt and the earnest promoter of the enterprise, was a vassal of the Sultan. At the formal opening almost all the maritime nations were represented by warships, which passed through the canal in an imposing and memorable procession. The occasion was honored by the presence of European sovereigns, among them Empress Eugénie and the emperor of Austria-Hungary.

**Foreign Loans and Bankruptcy.**—In 1854, during the exigencies of the Crimean War, the government obtained a foreign loan of £5,000,000. The next year it borrowed a like amount. To its surprise it found foreign capitalists not only willing but desirous to advance their money in return for its promise to pay. With that thoughtlessness of the morrow which characterizes the Ottoman, it was of all others the easiest and most agreeable way to obtain a revenue. By March, 1865, the entire public debt amounted to about £36,700,000. Within the next ten years the total of foreign indebtedness had grown to nearly if not quite £230,000,000. That is, it had increased in the proportion of about £20,000,000 a year! To show for it there were only a few elegant but useless edifices here and there and a fleet of equally useless ironclads, always anchored in a majestic semicircle along the Bosphorus in front of the Sultan's palace, not for his protection but for his amusement.

The day of reckoning came in less than a quarter of a century after that first loan of 1854. Up to 1875 the interest had always been promptly paid, even if a new loan was necessary to obtain the funds. At last even the interest could no longer be provided for. On October 6, 1875, the grand vizier, Mahmoud Nedim Pasha, announced that the state was bankrupt. He considered himself in no small degree justified for partial repudiation by the fact that the nominal sums had by no means been received, the later loans especially being effected at ruinous rates, and that the interest already paid on certain loans was larger than the original amount.

**Death of Sultan Abd-ul Aziz.**—The troubles in Herzegovina (1875), the massacres in Bulgaria (1875), and the war with Montenegro and Servia (1876-1877) make the last years in the reign of Sultan Abd-ul Aziz to be

long remembered. Ali Pasha, Fuad Pasha, General Omar Pasha, all his tried statesmen and supporters, were dead. The grand vizier, Mahmoud Nedim Pasha, was the creature of General Ignatieff, the Russian ambassador. The empire was in a condition hardly better than anarchy from one end to the other. The long patience, even of the Mussulmans, was exhausted. The softas or theological students terrified the Sultan into the appointment of ministers of their choice. A few days later the Sheik-ul-Islam gave a fetva approving his deposition. Midhat Pasha, an energetic man whose government of several provinces had been signalized by violent reforms, headed a conspiracy. The Sultan was quietly dethroned (May 24, 1876). A few days later he was found dead. The court physicians declared he had committed suicide.

He visited the International Exposition at Paris in 1867, being the only Ottoman sovereign who in peaceful fashion had set foot in a foreign country. But he learned nothing in his travels and brought back only added aversion to Western ways. His one success was in humbling the viceroy of Egypt, his vassal, on whom he had previously bestowed the almost regal title of khedive. He compelled him to reduce his army, surrender his ironclads, and abstain from exercising the attributes of sovereignty. It had been his lifelong ambition to assure the succession to his son, Yusuf Izeddin, thus setting aside the Ottoman custom, which vests the inheritance in the oldest member of a dynasty and not in direct descent. By his deposition all his careful plans were brought to naught. His nephew, Sultan Murad V, was at once proclaimed. The excitement caused by the tragic death of his uncle and by the assassination of some of his ministers at a cabinet meeting unsettled his reason. He was removed by the sultan-maker, Midhat Pasha, and his brother, Sultan Abd-ul Hamid II, reigned in his stead.

**The Reign of Sultan Abd-ul Hamid II** (1876-1908).—No other Sultan in the Mosque of Eyoub ever girded on the sword of Osman—the Turkish equivalent of coronation—in national conditions so appalling.

Rebellion was rampant in Bosnia and Herzegovina and imminent in Arabia. Montenegro and Servia had declared war and the Turks believed that Europe, and certainly Russia, were about to do the same. The horrors of Bulgarian massacres had shocked and for a time alienated the empire's most persistent friends. The civil and military service was everywhere in utter confusion. The prodigality of preceding reigns had impoverished the people and brought on bankruptcy, which made further foreign loans impossible. There was no money to pay the troops. The ironclads could not move for lack of coal. The Young Turkey party, composed largely of Moslems who had lived abroad, not numerous but noisy, demanded thorough renovation of the empire. The vast majority of the Mussulmans, as bigoted as they were ignorant, denounced even the pretense of reform. Partisans of the dead Abd-ul Aziz were plotting to enthrone his son, Yusuf Izeddin. Partisans of the crazy Murad were plotting his restoration. Midhat had deposed two Sultans. Two dethronements in four months had made the idea of revolution grimly familiar. What Midhat Pasha had done twice he was capable of doing again. When Abd-ul Hamid ascended the throne in 1876 it was a common belief that he would not occupy it a year.

In December the formal conference of ambassadors opened at Constantinople. The Ottomans were not allowed representation at the sessions. The very day the delegates assembled salvos of artillery hailed the proclamation of a constitution by the Sultan. This constitution was most comprehensive and liberal. It was based upon the equality of all men and the sanctity of individual rights. It introduced the representative system. There was to be a senate, named for life by the Sultan, and a chamber of deputies, holding office for four years. The system of election was by universal suffrage and ballot. There was to be one deputy for every 50,000 Ottoman "citizens."

The Turks met the memorandum containing the definite propositions of the conference by counter propositions and pointed as a guarantee to their newly granted

constitution. "Few countries enjoy such a constitution as ours," said Midhat Pasha gravely to the ambassadors. The success of Turkish diplomacy during the last part of the nineteenth century was due to a simple and invariable policy. In any emergency by specious promises it sought to gain time, and the time thus gained it utilized in playing off the Powers against one another. The conference of ambassadors formulated an ultimatum. Midhat Pasha submitted this ultimatum to a national assembly of 180 Mussulman and sixty Christian notables. Only the one delegate, the head of the native Protestant community, dared vote for its acceptance. The other notables declared that it was contrary to the Ottoman Constitution and must hence be refused. Then the ambassadors quitted Constantinople, but dissensions had arisen among them and they were not in harmony as to the ultimatum they had proposed. The Russo-Turkish war of 1877-1878 and its consequences are described in the chapter on Russia.

The conclusion of the war did not bring internal peace to the broken empire. The Albanians soon rebelled and murdered Mehemet Ali Pasha, who had been sent to make amicable arrangements with them (1881). The Arabs, who had always looked down on their Turkish masters and lost no opportunity to weaken their authority, gave constant trouble and were subdued only at great cost. For a moment, on the occupation of Egypt by the British (1882), the Sultan was on the point of declaring war against Great Britain, but more prudent counsels prevailed. The Armenian massacres of 1894-1896, rivaling the atrocities of the time of the Greek revolution and exceeding in horror the massacres in Syria and Bulgaria, roused the indignation of the civilized world. But this time no foreign nation was ready to do more than exchange diplomatic notes and employ diplomatic pressure. The promises of 1868 to Crete were habitually ignored. The Cretan insurrections of 1877, 1885, 1887, and 1889 were succeeded by what seemed a life-and-death struggle in 1895 and 1896. Again the government promised reforms, forwarded a specious program, and appointed a Christian governor.

The Cretans despised pledges which had been violated so often and demanded annexation to Greece. The Greek government sent Prince George with a torpedo flotilla and Colonel Vassos with 1500 troops to the assistance of their brethren (February, 1897). Now a real concert of Europe was brought about, not to restrain despotism, but to crush men fighting for liberty. The ironclads of Austria-Hungary, France, Germany, Great Britain, Italy, and Russia blockaded Crete, landed a force of 3600 men, and bombarded the insurgents who had gained control of almost the whole island. The war of 1897 between Greece and Turkey was the result.

At first Sultan Abd-ul Hamid II was only a phantom upon the throne. Were he really to reign, it was necessary to break the virtual dictatorship of Midhat Pasha, who was a tool of Great Britain as Mahmoud Nedim Pasha had been of Russia. Reports, skillfully put in circulation, and the arrogant bearing of the Pasha, sapped his popularity. Suddenly arrested at midnight (February, 1877) he was obliged to give up the seals of office and go at once into exile. Later on he was recalled and made governor of Smyrna. Accused of the murder of Sultan Abd-ul Aziz, he was tried and convicted. The sentence of death was remitted and he was banished to Arabia, where he died. All the men who had conspired against Sultan Abd-ul Aziz and Sultan Murad V and all the prominent partisans of those sovereigns were gradually stripped of power. The Sultan took the entire administration upon himself. By a revolution, as silent as it was slow and effectual, all real authority was removed from the grand vizier and centered in his own hands. The palace superseded the Porte. The cabinet officers became hardly more than the Sultan's secretaries, the two essentials for their continuance in office being ability and subservience. Since the Ottoman Parliament ended its brief existence with its second session (1880), there was little discussion of "reforms." The most personal of personal governments ruled at Yildiz Kiosk. But inherent in it were all the radical and fatal evils of absolutism.

The German Emperor and Empress visited the Sultan

in 1889. This visit they repeated in 1898, combining therewith a tour through the Holy Land. The valuable concessions then obtained for the Germans emphasized the intimate relations of the two empires.